PROCEEDINGS

Peace & Unity

Sixteenth Constitutional Convention

Toronto
April / May 1986

88-02045/

16th

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

of the

CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS

TORONTO, ONT.

APRIL 28 – MAY 2, 1986

FRATERNAL DELEGATES FROM THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR — CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

1956 GEORGE MEANY

1958 JOSEPH BIERNE

1960 GEORGE HARRISON

1962 LAWRENCE RAFTERY

1964 JOSEPH KEENAN

1966 I. W. ABEL

1968 HOWARD COUGHLIN

1970 A. F. GROSPIRON

1972 PETER BOMMARITO

1974 C. L. DENNIS

1976 JOSEPH P. TONELLI

1978 LLOYD McBRIDE

1980 JOHN KELLY

1982 MURRAY H. FINLEY

1984 LYNN WILLIAMS

1986 RICHARD I. KILROY

FRATERNAL DELEGATES FROM THE BRITISH TRADES UNION CONGRESS

1956 CHARLES J. GEDDES, C.B.E.

1958 SIR ALFRED ROBERTS
WILFRED BEARD

1960 SIR THOMAS WILLIAMSON
ROBERT WILLIS

1962 JOHN L. SIMONS
JAMES H. SOUTHALL

1964 FREDERICK HAYDAY
ROBERT MAIN

1966 LORD HAROLD COLLISON
JOSEPH O'HAGAN

1968 LORD LEWIS WRIGHT
GEORGE H. LOWTHIAN

1970 FRANK COUSINS
JOSEPH CRAWFORD

1972 LORD COOPER
DANIEL McGARVEY

1974 GEORGE H. DOUGHTY
JAMES L. JONES

1976 LORD ALFRED ALLEN, C.B.E.
C. MARIE PATTERSON

1978 T. G. W. ELDER

1980 JOHN WEAVER

1982 SIR JOHN BOYD
SIDNEY WEIGHELL

1984 ALAN SAPPER
BILL WHATLEY

1986 EDMOND SCRIVENS
DESMOND DUTFIELD

INDEX OF PROCEEDINGS

ADDRESSES
Fraternal Delegates
Richard I. Kilroy, AFL-CIO ... 71-72
Edmond Scrivens, TUC ... 80-81
John Vanderveken, General Secretary, ICFTU ... 54-55
Other Guests
Ed Boadbent, Federal Leader, NDP ... 37-38
Jay Naidoo, General Secretary, COSATU ... 12-13
John Simonds, ILO ... 104-106
Zhang Ruiying, Vice-Chairperson, All-China Federation of Trade Unions ... 122-123
President Shirley Carr ... 103
President Dennis McDermott ... 81-83
Secretary-Treasurer Shirley Carr, Solidarity Address ... 3-8
Welcome
Clifford Pilkey, President, Ontario Federation of Labour ... 1
Michael Lyons, President, Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto ... 1

BUILDING TRADES
Organization Committee ... 103-131

CANADA PENSION PLAN
Social Action & Services Committee ... 90-91

CONSTITUTION AND LAWS COMMITTEE
Deadline, Convention resolutions ... 66-67
Five-year limit, re-entry of disaffiliated unions ... 67
Mandatory affiliation, labour councils ... 68-70

CONVENTION COMMITTEES
List ... 143
Referral of Reports and Resolutions ... 9

CONVENTION GUESTS
Introduction, fraternal delegates, other guests ... 2, 27, 55, 119
NDP guests ... 36, 72
NFU President ... 66

CONVENTION PROCEDURE
Chairing of Convention — explanation by Pres. D. McDermott ... 2-3

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE
Reports ... 8, 27, 61, 101, 129

DAY OF MOURNING for Workers Killed and Injured on the Job
Inauguration by the CLC ... 8-9
B.C. Cities and Edmonton ... 72
City of Hamilton, Ontario ... 66
City of Ottawa ... 43
Federal government ... 72
Province of Manitoba, & Cities in Manitoba ... 55

DEREGULATION
Our Canada or Theirs? Workers Confront the Corporate Blueprint (1986 Statement of Free Trade, Deregulation and Privatization)
Text ... 13-19
Debate ... 19-25
Resolutions ... 43

ECONOMIC POLICY
Our Canda or Theirs? Workers Confront the Corporate Blueprint (1986 Statement on Free Trade, Dergulation and Privatization)
Text ... 13-19
Debate ... 19-25
Resolutions ... 43

Full Employment and Fairness — the Workers' Agenda for Canada
Text ... 28-33
Debate ... 33-36
Resolutions ... 43-44

EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Ergonomics, CLC audio-visuals ... 118-119
Labour College of Canada: Bricks & Mortar Committee ... 119
Labour education, school curricula ... 115-116
Transfer payments, post-secondary education ... 116-118
Tribute to Jim Brechin ... 115

ELECTION OF OFFICERS ... 102, 103-104, 112-113, 118

ENERGY COMMITTEE
Chernobyl disaster ... 125-127
Oil Prices ... 128

FREE TRADE
Our Canada or Theirs? Workers Confront the Corporate Blueprint (1986 Statement on Free Trade, Deregulation and Privatization)
Text ... 13-19
Debate ... 19-25
Resolutions ... 43

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND FAIRNESS — THE WORKERS' AGENDA FOR CANADA
(Economic Policy Committee)
Text ... 28-33
Debate ... 33-36
Resolutions ... 43-44

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS
Artistic, cultural agencies, Canadian production, control ... 134
Boycott, South African products ... 134
CLC peace co-ordinator ... 134-136
Capital punishment, opposition ... 51-52
Child abuse, national program ... 51
Convention facilities ... 136
Marine Post Office, Welland Canal ... 53-54
Property rights ... 133-134
Travel agents, unionized ... 52-53

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
Continuing education, public sector ... 112
Freedom of Association ... 107-108
Government "down-sizing" ... 112, 113-114
NAPE Strike ... 66
Political Rights ... 106-107
Public Service Staff Relations Act ... 108-109
Saskatchewan's Abrogation of Employees' Rights ... 109
Strike Rights ... 109-110
Whistle-blowers' Legislation ... 110-112

HUMAN RIGHTS
Aboriginal People's Rights 9-10
Opposition to Racist Jokes, Literature 10-12
Racism, Union Education (CLC) 10-11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
International Affairs and the Pursuit of Human Dignity: a Canadian Labour Response (Policy Statement) 56-58
Debate 58-60, 61-63
Central America 64-65
Peace Co-ordinator, CLC (General Resolution Com.) 134-136
South Africa 63-64
South African Products' Boycott (General Resolutions Com.) 134

KIDS UNION 119

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
Federal First Contract Legislation (Organization Com.) 131-133
Job-retention, arbitral grievances 26-27
Minimum Wage 25-26
Part-time Workers 26
Work-orders from Employers Engaged in a Strike or Lockout (CEIC) 27

MANDATORY RETIREMENT
Social Action & Service Com. 87-88

MAY DAY
Centenary 102
May Day, South Africa 133

MEDICARE
Social Action and Services Com. 136-138

MINIMUM WAGE
Legislative Com. 25-26

NEWFOUNDLAND ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES (NUPGE)
NAPE Strike 66

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY
Asbestos — exposure limits, replacement, education 72-76, 84-85, 114
Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (CCOHS) — funding 141
CCOHS — Guidelines re-exposure to toxic substances 141-142

OFFICERS' REPORTS
Committee Report 76-77
Debate 77-80

OLD AGE SECURITY
Social Action & Services Com. 90-91

ORGANIZATION
Airport Security Guards 100-101, 129-130
Boycott Procedures 97
Building Trades 130-131
Federal First Contract Legislation 131-133
Fish Plants, N.B. 130
Non-affiliated Unions 97-98
Organizing, N.B. 130
Raiding 97
Unemployment, Coalitions 98-100
Union Label 101

PART-TIME WORKERS
Legislative Com. 26

PENSIONS
Canada Pension Plan, Old Age Security 90-91
Pension Indexing 138
Workers' Control (Social Action & Services' Com.) 88-90

POLITICAL EDUCATION
February, NDP Affiliation Month 39-42
Municipal Election Schools 42-43
Tribute to Tommy Douglas 38-39

POST OFFICE
Marine Post Office, Welland Canal 53-54

PRIVATIZATION
Our Canada or Theirs? Workers Confront the Corporate Blueprint (1986 Statement on Free Trade, Deregulation and Privatization)
Text 13-19
Debate 19-25
Resolutions 43

SOCIAL ACTION AND SERVICES
Canada Pension Plan, Old Age Security 90-91
Mandatory Retirement 87-88
Medicare 136-138
Pension Funds, Workers' Control 88-90
Pension Indexing 138
Unemployment Insuraance 85-87

STRUCK WORK
Work-orders from Employers Engaged in a Strike or Lock-out — CEIC (Legislative Com.) 27

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
Automatic Tellers 91
Canada Labour Code, Amendment, Control of Tech. Change by Workers and Their Communities 94-95
CLC Education and Special Government Department 93-94
Mandatory Retraining, Employer-paid 96
Public Sector Negotiation, Retraining 96-97
Reduced Work Time, CLC Programs 95-96
Workers' Voice, Safety and Benefits 91-93

TRANSPORTATION AND MARITIME COMMITTEE
Canadian Merchant Marine 123-125
CN Shops, Moncton 138-140
Railway Safety, Request for Inquiry 140-141
Shipbuilding Industry 119-122

TRIBUTE TO TOMMY DOUGLAS 38-39

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE
Social Action & Services Com. 85-87

UNION LABEL
Union Label Trades and Services 101, 128-129

WOMEN's COMMITTEE
Child Care 45
Equal Pay, Work of Equal Value 46-49
Federal Funding, Women's Centres and Services 49
Non-traditional Jobs 49
Pornography, Opposition 49
Pregnant Workers' Rights 49-50

WORK WEEK
Reduced Work Time, CLC Programs (Technology Committee) 95-96

Canadian Labour Congress
Proceedings of the
16th Constitutional Convention
TORONTO
April 28–May 2, 1986

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1986
Morning Session

The Sixteenth Constitutional Convention was called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Michael Lyons, President of the Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto.

ADDRESSES OF WELCOME

MR. M. LYONS (President, Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto): On behalf of the officers, the Executive Board, and the 175,000 affiliated members of our labour council, I am delighted to welcome you to our city, Toronto. Thirty years ago in this city, the founding convention of the CLC was held and Brother Claude Jodoin was elected its first president. It was a convention that truly united the labour movement in Canada and the result of that unity has been an outstanding number of accomplishments over the past three decades. The fact is that the Canadian labour movement has been of assistance both to union people and non-union people in every single part of this country and, in fact, throughout the world. We have a record that we can truly be very proud of. But today our labour movement is faced with several severe challenges. However, I do not think there is anyone in this room who doubts that the biggest problem we have today is Brian Mulroney and his Tory government.

At a time when the No. 1 priority of the country is very obviously job-creation, our Prime Minister is madly pursuing a free trade agreement with the United States and that free trade agreement could in fact cost us Canada. If our Prime Minister is successful — and Lord help us if he is — then hundreds of thousands of Canadian workers will be added to the more than one million who are already unemployed. Deregulation, that plague for both public and private sector workers, will become even more widespread than it is now, leading to even more deterioration of many very important services. In fact, that could lead to a real risk to our health and our safety. At the same time that all this is happening, many of our vital social programs, like Unemployment Insurance and medicare, could be lost, along with a great deal of our cultural heritage. A free trade agreement with the United States would be an immense tragedy and the labour movement in Canada must continue to do everything it can to make sure it never happens. In a few days we are going to be electing a new CLC president, our fifth. I hope that you will agree with me that if the labour movement is going to successfully oppose free trade as well as meet the other challenges that are facing us, then we are going to have to be even more united behind our new president than we were in 1956.

Although this is going to be a busy week, I hope that you are going to be able to find some time to relax and enjoy our city. We have made some plans to help you do just that. I also want to take a minute to tell you about something I consider to be a most exciting event, "May Works", our labour council's first annual festival of working people in the arts, designed as a tribute to labour. May Works will be looking at the many positive things that working people have contributed to our society. So, if you are tired of seeing some corporate logos on the program every time you go to a theatre or a concert, and if you do not like the way working people are portrayed in the movies on television, and if you do not think that Dynasty and Dallas reflect the values and goals of working people, then let me urge you to get out to one or more of the May Works events during this week.

Metro Toronto is a city of many communities. It is made up of people from many ethnic and cultural backgrounds. So, if you are going to wander around, try and get out of the downtown core, visit these communities, talk to the people — sample their food. While you are out there wandering and exploring, there are just two things I would ask that you do not do. One, is do not visit Canada's Wonderland and second, do not buy the *Toronto Sun*; there are boycotts on both.

I would now like the delegates to rise and to join Lita Classen, a member of the Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists (ACTRA) who is going to be accompanied by her mother, Melitta Classen, on the piano, to sing "O Canada". That is going to be followed by Lita and the Travellers leading us in "Solidarity Forever".

(Singing of O Canada and Solidarity Forever)

MR. M. LYONS (President, LCMT): It is my pleasure now to introduce a member of UAW Local 222 in Oshawa, a former member of the Ontario Legislature, the President of the Ontario Federation of Labour, Cliff Pilkey.

MR. C. PILKEY (President, Ontario Federation of Labour): You meet here in Toronto in this beautiful Metro Convention Centre at a very important time in the history of the labour movement. A year ago in this province, we saw a phenomenon in operation, when a Progressive Conservative provincial government was turned out of office after 42 years. The New Democratic Party in Ontario played a very important role. They worked out an agreement with the Liberals which provided changes in the programs and the laws of this province; that was known as the Accord. Legislation is now being put in place that calls for: equal pay for work of equal value, first agreement legislation, improvements in workers' compensation, occupational health and safety, a banning of extra-billing by doctors and many other improvements in the interest of working people of this province. We are very proud of that.

On Saturday, there were some 8,000 people in a demonstration against free trade in front of Queen's Park. We, in Ontario, and I hope in every other province and territory across the nation, are working very hard to make sure that free trade with the United States does not become a reality. We are for economic and cultural and political sovereignty and, I tell you, free trade will have a profound and fundamental effect on all of us. It will change the Canadian way of life. This is not a perfect society, but we want to remain Canadians and we want to control our own destiny.

Many of our adversaries will be watching this Convention very carefully and, as a result, we must display a sense of unity and solidarity as never before. I know this labour movement will formulate programs and policies in this Convention that reflect the interest and concerns of our membership, regardless of our divergent views. Together we can build a stronger, more powerful labour movement.

MR. M. LYONS (President, LCMT): It is now my honour to turn the gavel and the convention over to the retiring President of the Canadian Labour Congress, Dennis McDermott.

Introduction of Fraternal Delegates

MR. D. McDERMOTT (President, Canadian Labour Congress): My first task this morning is to introduce probably the largest foreign delegation we have ever had to a CLC Convention, from some of our important allies around the world and other visiting guests.

The first persons really need no introduction: Joe Morris, the President Emeritus of the Canadian Labour Congress; Donald Montgomery, the former Secretary-Treasurer of the Canadian Labour Congress; Henry Lorrain, the incumbent Ombudsman of the CLC; Dick Kilroy who is the President of the Brotherhood of Railway, Airline & Steamship Clerks, the AFL-CIO Fraternal Delegate; from the British TUC, Edmond Scrivens, a member of the Executive Council and a member of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers, and Mrs. Scrivens, and Desmond Dutfield from the National Union of Mineworkers.

For the first time, I believe, we have delegations present from national labour centres that are known as non-aligned, that is to say they belong to neither the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions or the World Federation of Trade Unions. And by great coincidence, a man from the land of my ancestors, from the Irish Congress of Trade Unions, their President, Jim McCusker and Mrs. McCusker.

The next one is the All-China Federation of Trade Unions. Our friends from this country represent a trade union centre of 18 million people. From the People's Republic of China, Mrs. Zhang Ruiying, delegation leader, ACFTU Vice-Chairwoman and Standing Committee Member of the Chinese National People's Congress; Huang Rujie, Deputy Director of the ACFTU International Liaison Department; and Miss Huang Jing, Deputy Section Chief of the ACFTU International Liaison Department.

From the ICFTU, our good friend, the General Secretary, John Vanderveken.

From the International Labour Organization, our good friend John Simonds, representative of the Director-General; and another old friend, John Whitehouse, the ILO Director in Canada.

Another important delegation, from the Congress of South African Trade Unions, Jay Naidoo, the General Secretary; and Alec Erwin, the Education Secretary of that organization.

We have also with us, because we had some meetings over the weekend of the Commonwealth Trade Union Council which I happened to have chaired since its inception, a very good friend, Frank Walcott, General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, former president of the Caribbean Congress of Labour and currently a member of the Barbados Parliament; a member of the ILO Governing Body from Australia, Bill Richardson of the Australian Council of Trade Unions; from Zambia, Sam Lungu, Assistant General Secretary of the Trade Union Congress there; Carl Wright, the Director of the CTUC, and Mrs. Wright; and David Clement, the Education Assistant of the CTUC.

Moving a little closer to home now, a good friend that we have had for many years and worked very closely with, Louis (Smokey) Bruyère, President of the Native Council of Canada; Jerzy Milewski, the Representative in exile of the Polish Solidarnosc; our good friend, May-Britt Carlsson, the former Swedish Labour Attaché.

Convention Procedure

MR. D. McDERMOTT (CLC President): The Convention procedure this morning will be perhaps a little bit different than it has been in the past and I would like you to bear with me for a few minutes while I explain. It revolves around me personally, of course.

It is 38 years since I joined Local 439 of the UAW/CIO here in the city of Toronto, working for the grand sum of 80 cents an hour with the fledgling union, on a two-page contract. I do not have to explain to you the differences from that day to this, courtesy of the collective trade union movement in this country. I look at the surroundings that we meet in now, I can recall my first UAW convention in 1950, down in Atlantic City. There were six of us from Local 439; one guy checked in and the rest went up the fire escape. I remember that when I am sitting in that suite in the hotel. And it is 38 years, 32 of which, I guess, I have spent as a full-time representative in one capacity or another; 38 years of struggle on bread and butter issues, on social political issues; 38 years of toiling in the vineyards of democracy. I want to tell you, if I had to do it all over again, I would not hesitate for any one single minute of it. It has been a great joy! And the great joy, really, is not just the sense of achievement and noting the contribution of the labour movement to the welfare of the human family, but rather it has been the people. I can tell you unequivocally there is no better organization in society, there is not one better group of men and women than the national labour movement here in this country.

I have often said, when I speak to the law societies and the bankers' associations and the like, the labour movement in this country has changed the lifestyle of people dramatically. We pioneered on health care, we pioneered on more leisure time, we pioneered on a safer and better workplace, we pioneered in vacations with pay, old age security, human rights, civil liberties, you name it! "What in the hell have you ever pioneered for people?", I ask them. And the answer is that no single institution in society has done more for Canadians, whether they are members of the labour movement or not. The reality is that the competitive standards that we have set, by persuasive negotiations and long and bitter struggles, have been inherited by millions of Canadians who have never paid a cent of union dues but, nevertheless, enjoy the lifestyle that we, in fact, pioneered for them.

As you know, I had an opportunity to go one more term. But, after a lot of thought and very careful consideration, I did in fact, decide to step down at this Convention and I announced that intention back in November of last year. I talked it over with my good friend, my wife; we decided that we would wind it down, play a little more golf, do some serious writing. I was all geared to that and then suddenly, last January, along came this new opportunity. When Brian Mulroney called me and gave me the opportunity of becoming the Ambassador to the Republic of Ireland, after I picked myself up off the floor, I said to him: "You know, there is no possible way I can do this, until May anyway, because I have a mandate from the CLC to finish and I intend to finish it". His reply was: "Take your time, the post has been vacant for some time anyway. Protocol requires that we have to get the approval of the Irish government and that usually takes a couple of months, so do not worry about it." One week later he called me back and said: "I do not know what your Dublin connections are, but I just sent the communiqué a couple of days ago and the approval is back on my desk. It took two days."

I can tell you that I was warmed by a couple of responses, because I know that there are some people that do not agree with it and that is perfectly okay, that is the way we are, that is the way we always will be; the response has been overwhelmingly supportive. Two things happened that really warmed my heart. The first one was a call from Tommy Douglas, a couple of days after the announcement was made public, and Tommy died a week later or a week and a half later. He said: "Dennis, I want you to know how really great I feel about this appointment. I think it is high time that a workers' representative became an ambassador to a country." And he said, I want you to know because Tommy even literally on his death bed could always come up with a joke, and he said: "It's only a bloody nuisance like me that will call you, Dennis and pester you about it, but believe me, hundreds of thousands of working people out there and others will feel elevated by association with this appointment." The second thing that warmed my heart was the unofficial response that I got from Dublin itself. It is said that they cocked their heads and said: "Well yes, he is going to be differ-

ent. He may not be quite as adept with his knife and fork as some of his predecessors, but at least we will understand what the hell he is talking about!"

So I guess what I am saying is that, after 38 years in the vineyard, I think with a pretty good track record, having announced my intention to retire anyway, I think I have the right like anyone else to pursue whatever job I see fit, after my retirement. I do not have to tell you that I did not cross the floor to become a Conservative. I am a Social Democrat, I will continue to be a Social Democrat and I will work for the ideals and the philosophy of Social Democrats all around this world. I have no intention of abandoning my trade union identity. I will continue to act and speak as a trade unionist, I will retain my trade union commitment. I might have to clean up my act a little bit but Dennis McDermott will continue to be Dennis McDermott and Brian Mulroney understands that perfectly well.

I think that trade union representatives are as capable of representing their country as any political head, corporate head or anyone else, and Claire and I are very proud and honoured to have been selected to this post. Canada, the land of my choice, is a country that I love with a deep and abiding passion. I am especially privileged to be its representative to Ireland of all places, the country of my ancestors, a country with which I have long-time affinity and affection. To me, that is the ultimate and I am extremely grateful for that opportunity. Claire and I are excited by the prospect, by the challenge, and we intend to work at it. We intend to do you proud and I know we go with your heartfelt wishes.

However, because of the fact that my appointment might appear to conflict with my traditional role at this Convention as Chairperson of very partisan, undoubtedly anti-government debate, I intend to forego my usual role as Chairperson. Instead, the Convention will be chaired by my good friend Shirley Carr and other officers. I understand that I am going to have an opportunity to appear back here sometime on the agenda at the appropriate time to say farewell. I wish you well in your deliberations. God bless all of you and believe me I am going to stay in touch. Thank you for your attention.

It is now my pleasure to turn the gavel over to Sister Shirley Carr.

SOLIDARITY ADDRESS
CLC Secretary-Treasurer Shirley Carr

MS. S. CARR (CLC Secretary-Treasurer, Chairperson): Thirty years ago on this date, April 28, 1956, some 1,600 trade unionists were on their way home following a week-long convention in this same city of Toronto where they had brought together and merged the Trades and Labour Congress and the Canadian Congress of Labour.

Those brothers and sisters laboured, with maturity, conviction and a far-sighted commitment to unity, to bring about organic union of these two labour bodies. It was their spirited determination and their vigorous pursuit of solidarity that resulted in the formation of what today we proudly salute as our Canadian Labour Congress.

The unity that underscored the activities of our brothers and sisters of thirty years ago hopefully will find a prominent place in our deliberations here this week. As we chart our course for the months and years to come, it is imperative that we do so united in solidarity: brothers and sisters, side by side; public sector worker, private sector worker, side by side: older worker, younger worker, side by side.

I open my remarks to you this morning with this call for unity because there clearly are forces at work in this land which are bent on shattering the very essence of our labour movement.

There are others who will do everything in their power, (and they do wield economic power) to frustrate our attempts to extend collective bargaining rights to others in the Canadian workplace.

On another front, we are challenged every day of our lives by a government whose seeming single purpose is to abdicate traditional roles of government, and turn management of what we have come to know as public institutions back to the private sector.

And overshadowing all of our activities is the persistent threat of nuclear holocaust, and the constant uncertainty that today's generation of school children may not live to greet the 21st century.

It is in the light of these challenges to our labour movement and to our individual security that I open this 30th anniversary Convention of the Canadian Labour Congress with an appeal for unity of purpose.

In preparing my notes for presentation this morning, I went to the archives to review the record of the proceedings of that founding convention of the Canadian Labour Congress. In reading the transcript, I took particular note of the statement on economic policy. Some of the concerns expressed in that economic policy statement of 30 years ago are still with us.

There was frequent reference to high levels of unemployment; to the need for public investment for job-creation; to the need for social investment; to reducing work hours to increase available employment. Sound familiar?

Today we are compelled to cope with government policy which serves major financial and corporate institutions in Canada and virtually denies the existence of the ongoing economic crisis plaguing the working people of Canada.

The recent Conservative budget continues a Tory tradition of neglect for the unemployed and a preoccupation with the deficit.

This same government takes pride making the point that by the end of this decade spending on government programs will amount to the same share of the national income as was the case 25 years ago. This ham-fisted approach to social policy means cutbacks in programs for all Canadians, and the loss of jobs to the people in the public sector who provide these services.

It is not my purpose this morning to review, in total, our concerns about the present government's economic and social policies. Suffice to say their track record to date falls far short of expectations we might have had as a result of their election platform.

I do, however, want to focus criticism on the three interconnected issues of privatization, deregulation and free trade. This three-headed monster is the Conservative government's version of Mammy Yokum's triple whammy.

The triple whammy, for those of you too young to remember Al Capp's cartoon strip, "Lil Abner", was Mammy's knockout punch.

And the present government does indeed have a parallel knockout punch. Privatization, deregulation and free trade have the potential to knock the stuffing out of Canada and the Canadian lifestyle.

I continue to be appalled to the blind march to free trade that this government has embarked on. On the other hand, I am proud and tremendously pleased that it is our Canadian trade union movement which has finally, effectively focused public attention and public concern on these policies and programs which not only undermine the social and economic fabric of our Canadian society, but attack the very foundation of our sovereignty and our distinctive Canadian way of life.

Yes, my friends, it is our trade union movement which has rung the alarm bells across this land on the free trade question. It is the working people in the hospitals and offices; in the factories; in the mills; in the shipyards who have said in unison:

"Now, wait a minute, do you seriously expect us to

believe that free trade with the United States in its global dimension is going to result in more Canadian jobs?"

They have said: "The Prime Minister tells us he is negotiating free access to the U.S. market. What he fails to tell us is that he, of course, is negotiating free access in both directions across the Canadian/U.S. borders."

Canadian working people continued: "Free trade will provide a great lure for multinationals and Canadian companies to abandon us and head for the U.S. Bible belt with its right-to-work laws, low wages and depressed working conditions."

They continued their critique and said: "Social and economic problems that we have struggled to put in place over the years will be jeopardized in a free trade environment. The Government of the United States views programs such as unemployment insurance, regional development subsidies, medicare, agriculture support programs, among others, as unfair subsidies."

Canadian workers realized from the beginning that what is at stake in the free trade talks is not only our economic future — our political independence is also at stake.

Over the course of the past two weeks, we have seen the U.S. Senate Finance Committee debate the question of whether the U.S. government should be allowed to enter free trade talks with Canada. The fact that Canada's economic and political future lay in the hands of 20 U.S. Senators, who were totally uninterested in Canada's future, was a feature of this episode that will be repeated over and over again if we enter a free trade pact with the U.S.

During the debate in the Senate Finance Committee, one of the Senators drew up a list of objectives for the U.S. in negotiations with Canada. The list included the following points:
— A reduction in Canadian government subsidies;
— Improved access for U.S. exports and services;
— Better patent protection for U.S. products in Canada;
— Increased access for U.S. firms to Canadian federal and provincial government contracts;
— A commitment by the provinces to live by any trade deal;
— No exclusion for Canada from U.S. trade law; and
— An assurance that U.S. investors in Canada would be treated the same as Canadian investors in the United States.

Each of these points challenges the right of Canadians to use our democratic political institutions to shape our social and economic futures. Our political independence is at stake in the debate on free trade, no matter what the Prime Minister might say to the contrary.

These same Canadian workers also quickly realized that a Canadian economy integrated with that of the United States could only be accomplished if many of our publicly-run institutions and corporations were put on the auction block and sold to the private sector.

It was also clear that Ronald Reagan's deregulated America would have to be copied in Canada.

Hence we witness the sale of DeHavilland Aircraft to Boeing of the U.S.A. and the sale of Canadian Arsenals to the private sector. We also see Canadair and Teleglobe Canada on the auction block.

On the deregulation side of the ledger, the government is moving quickly to remove basic protections for consumers to ensure that there is free market chaos in Canada to parallel that of the United States.

Deregulation in the airline industry imperils the safety of the travelling public and eliminates jobs.

Deregulation in the transportation industry undermines the quality of service, creates safety hazards and costs Canadian working people jobs.

Deregulation in the communications industry increases costs to ordinary consumers, decreases costs to large corporations and it eliminates jobs.

And the list goes on. Everything from the elimination of meat inspection, and the consequent elimination of meat inspectors, to contracting-out and privatization of garbage collection. Witness also the sale of liquor stores in Québec to the private sector and the management of several public hospitals and nursing homes which have been turned over to private entrepreneurs.

It is in our continuing interest, both as citizens of this country and as working people, that we continue the fight against the implementation of free trade, deregulation and privatization.

In my opening remarks and my call for unity, I made reference to forces at work in this country which would undermine the very foundations of our trade union movement. In so doing I turn your attention to the serious challenges we face in the courts since the enactment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

In at least a dozen cases across the country, rights which we have struggled to establish are now threatened in court applications.

In Manitoba, the union shop security clause, and major elements of the provincial Labour Relations Act are being challenged. In British Columbia, Manitoba and Ontario, our right to use our union dues to lobby governments for better labour laws, pensions, health and safety legislation, are all under attack. Again, in Ontario, a case is coming on which attacks the whole scheme of the Labour Relations Act, the act which sets out many of the rights and freedoms of working people.

And then there is the politically motivated case sponsored by the right-wing National Citizens' Coalition, which is asking the courts to cripple the labour movement's social, economic and political agenda. They are trying to mask their political attack under the guise of their interpretation of the Charter of Rights dealing with freedom of association, as outlined under "Fundamental Freedoms" in the Constitution Act, Part I, which deals with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and freedom of expression. The words "the individual's freedom of association and freedom of expression" elicit an instinctive feeling of sympathy. After all, in our society we all believe in freedom of expression and freedom of association. But to really understand those words, and what they mean in the context of the labour movement, you have to look more carefully at what is happening.

What the National Citizens' Coalition really wants is to have the courts limit what we as trade unions can do to represent our members. They want the courts to restrict our ability to lobby governments for better labour laws, better pensions, stronger health and safety laws, medicare, and all of the other laws or programs which are so important to all working people.

They want the courts to say that we in the union movement can only spend our money on negotiating the local contract and handling grievances and arbitrations at the local level.

We all recognize that there are limits on what we can accomplish at the bargaining table. If we really want to represent our members and help all working people, we have to organize effective legislative and political campaigns to convince governments to pass better laws.

Fundamentally, the National Citizens' Coalition objects to our financial support for the New Democratic Party. On the other hand, they do not object when the banks, the insurance companies, the oil companies, Michelin Tire, and the mining companies all give hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Liberals and the Conservatives each year.

When corporations give money to the Liberals or the Conservatives, do they ask their individual shareholders if they would like to get a pro-rata rebate of the money that is given to the political party? Of course not. Corporate directors are expected

to look out for the best interests of the corporation — for the collectivity of property and financial interests. The leadership of the trade union movement has a similar responsibility — to the collectively shared interests of our members as working people.

The judgement in this and other cases really has to do with an understanding of collective rights. And while I do not want to sound an overly pessimistic note, I must confess to you that I have some apprehension about the judiciary's ability to understand the nature of our collective activity.

Judges, and the community at large, must answer questions about and understand the imperatives of collective solidarity on a picket line. They have to answer questions about difficulties we have in sustaining collective action if some people try to have a free ride. They must address the proposition that we in our unions, if we are to survive, must work collectively, to support political parties which best reflect our views and our agenda.

Each and every one of these cases now before the courts will have a profound effect on the shape and nature of our labour movement, but, more important, on the whole future of the labour movement. I want to give you the assurance that we are monitoring every single one of them, and that we, in fact, have joined status as intervenor in a number of instances.

While the courts continue to judge the questions of our political and related activities, we can take some measure of satisfaction from indications of growing support for Ed Broadbent and the New Democratic Party in all regions of Canada.

1986 is not only the 30th anniversary of the founding of the Canadian Labour Congress, but is also the 25th anniversary of our New Democratic Party.

And in this 25th anniversary year we now can legitimately claim to be a national force.

Polls indicate our support to be over 20 per cent in every region of the country, and there are growing expectations we will be able to elect New Democrats east of the Ottawa River. Cape Breton and Corner Brook have shown in the past it can be done. In the next federal election there is real potential for workers in Quebec and Atlantic Canada to join with sisters and brothers elsewhere in sending to Ottawa people representing the party of working people.

In making this point, I in no way want to suggest that people in other parts of Canada can rest on their laurels. Ontario has achieved meaningful change provincially with the Accord that ended forty years of Tory rule and that surely signaled hope for more breakthroughs at the federal level.

Our recent electoral success in Manitoba hopefully will be followed by the election of New Democratic Party governments in Saskatchewan and British Columbia before this year is out; and while the challenge is great, there are reasons to hope for significant gains in Alberta.

One of the crucial elements in maintaining and building support for our party is dialogue with the membership of our unions. Manitoba demonstrated how members can be motivated to support the New Democratic Party on issues such as first contract legislation, pay equity and a jobs fund.

In Ontario, workers' support for New Democrats has resulted in introduction of progressive legislation in the areas of pay equity and first contract legislation.

First contract legislation raises yet another issue I want to review with you this morning. At the outset, let me be clear that we should welcome and embrace the concept of first contract legislation. But let me be equally candid and say that gains won at the bargaining table will not necessarily flow from legislation, but rather from tough, militant, committed well-organized bargaining units.

Our struggles to help organize workers in the service sector have produced more than our fair share of frustration in the past two years.

First, we had that harrowing, unsettling battle with the Eaton company, waged by an absolutely amazing, gallant group of women and men who were fed up with Eaton's paternalism, favoritism and sexism.

The Eaton workers' heroic struggle was matched by the valiant battle waged by members of the Union of Bank Employees in their campaign to secure a first collective agreement at the Bank of Commerce Visa Centre here in Toronto.

These are but two of a long list of confrontations we have experienced in the service sector over the past two years. The people who work in these banks and stores, mainly women, continue to be among the lowest paid and the most poorly protected in our work force, and we have an obligation, all of us, to double and redouble our efforts to work with them to ensure they have the kinds of union protection and security that many of the rest of us enjoy.

In the aftermath of the strike and settlement at the Bank of Commerce, the Canada Labour Relations Board issued an historic and scathing indictment of the employer. The Board said, in part: "The Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce's short-term plan was to keep the union impotent, with the long-term goal of protecting its business without the encumbrance of collective bargaining."

The 89-page judgement issued by the Board went on to say: "The bank is still prepared to go to extreme lengths to make sure the concept of collective bargaining does not spread amongst its employees. It has chosen the bargaining table as its main line of defence."

The judgement said further that the bank's strategy was: "to stall, shuffle words but not substance, and to stretch the negotiations out as long as possible."

The judgement said further "most of the bank's movement, and there was precious little of that, came in the area where the standards are set by law."

In short, what we saw was the bank's uncompromising yet skillfully camouflaged rejection of the principles of the freedom of association upon which the Canada Labour Code is founded.

Let me say at this juncture that the very same criticism can be made of Eaton's bargaining strategy. Their collective bargaining team went to the same school that instructed the Commerce negotiators.

Now, I am not so naive as to think that criticism, no matter how severe, from the Canada Labour Relations Board is going to cause executive row at Commerce Court to roll over and play dead.

They have already issued a whining "who me" press release posturing disbelief that anyone could think ill of them.

No, it's refreshing every now and then to have the rightness and justness of our position vindicated; but if we are going to prevail, if we are going to get this matter satisfactorily resolved, once and for all, then we are going to have to mobilize in unprecedented fashion to ensure that we build strong bargaining units and that we negotiate agreements that will preserve and sustain their viability.

I made the point a few moments ago that the majority of workers at both Eaton's and the Commerce are women, and I want to turn now briefly to talk about the treatment of women and the treatment of minorities, disabled people and native people in the workplace.

On International Women's Day in 1985, the federal government announced that they would act on the recommendations of the Royal Commission Report on Equality in Employment. Their response to Judge Abella's recommendations came in the form

of Bill C-62, "An Act Respecting Employment Equity", which was introduced in Parliament last June. With only minor amendments, this bill received third reading last Wednesday. Contrary to what this government would like people to believe, mandatory affirmative action legislation for women, native people, disabled persons and visible minorities is still not a reality. Bill C-62 falls far short of this basic requirement. Bill C-62 *does not* make it mandatory for employers to implement affirmative action programs. We believe that this legislation will do little to rectify the systemic discrimination that has been experienced for years in this country by women, native people, disabled persons and visible minorities.

Working with a national coalition of organizations representing the target groups referred to in the legislation, we collectively fought for major amendments to the legislation.

First of all, we contend there must be an enforcement mechanism to ensure that employers actually implement employment equity programs.

Second, we insist there must be an obligation on employers to negotiate with the union the planning and implementation of employment equity. Further, equal pay for work of equal value must be an integral part of employment equity programs.

It is also clear to us that the government, as a major employer, must lead the way and make itself and its public service employees, through their unions, subject to the legislation.

Finally, there must be a requirement for all employers doing business with the government to implement employment equity programs in line with the legislation.

What I'm saying to you, brothers and sisters, is that we need some action on affirmative action. Until we get action on these five points, the so-called employment equity legislation will not have the clout to bring about meaningful change in the workplace.

Another area where we are indeed getting action, some good, some bad, has been in the field of occupational health and safety.

On the "down" side, we have seen the dilution of legislated health and safety standards in several Canadian jurisdictions. At the same time the safety inspectorates have been made weaker and inspectors have been discouraged from enforcing the rules effectively. "Deregulation" has hit health and safety and, with the shining exception of Manitoba, the scene gets worse as one travels West.

But the picture is not all bleak. We have worked for, and seen the introduction of, health and safety legislation in P.E.I. and Nova Scotia and there have been successes through our active involvement in the Health and Safety Commissions of Quebec and New Brunswick. After a six-year battle, conducted mainly through the CLC's National Health and Safety Committee, we have seen improvements in Part IV of the Canada Labour Code, and federal public servants now come under the Code for the first time. These changes came into effect on March 31 of this year and we expect the extension of Part IV of the Code to other groups of workers under federal jurisdiction to take place in a matter of months from now.

However, I think it is safe to say that our most significant accomplishment since we met last in Convention has been agreement on a national standard for the "Right to Know" as it relates to hazardous materials in the workplace.

After two years of tough and sometimes acrimonious negotiation, labour, business, and government reached consensus on "Right to Know" regulations and support for this protection is growing across the country.

I am fully aware that the agreement as it stands is imperfect. But I want to assure you that our negotiators gave it their very best shot. Having come to terms with both the employer and government on this sensitive question, we must commit ourselves to promoting the exact terms of the agreement without any modifications.

There was one other set of concerns expressed at that founding convention of the Canadian Labour Congress thirty years ago which have a parallel in our deliberations here this week. The International Affairs Report of 1956, among other things, deplored "white supremacy in South Africa", called for the abolition of "all stocks of hydrogen and atomic weapons", and made reference to the fragile peace in the world of that day.

Today, April 1986, we reiterate the imperative need for disarmament in a troubled world, one where the basic need for defence is often used to justify more weapons and less hope. Today we are joined by others who now condemn the racist South African government as the chorus of indignation swells.

In 1956, we emphasized a fundamental truth! "Defence is not simply a matter of guns and planes and bombs, of armies, navies and air forces. It is also a matter of rooting out poverty and exploitation, especially in under-developed countries, where these are most acute."

Tragically, poverty and exploitation are still a dominant feature of the politics and economies of many countries in the Third World.

Tragically, fighting is almost universal. Since the last World War, more than 150 major and armed conflicts have taken place, most of them in developing countries. At the root of these conflicts were evils which we have long opposed: the legacy of colonialism, racism, naked competition for trade resources, and uncontrolled superpower rivalry.

To achieve lasting peace, we need from our politicians those policies which will disarm people in terms of their attitudes, and this will require dialogue, maturity, understanding and commitment, not rhetoric; new thinking, new initiatives, not old prejudices.

It was that great citizen of the world, Albert Einstein, who said that "Everything has changed but our mode of reasoning and so we drift toward unparalleled disaster." These were his words after the explosion of the first atomic bomb.

Today peace is in great danger. There are too few signs that either of the superpowers is ready to respond to the determined wish of people throughout the world for an easing of tension and a drawing back from the nuclear precipice. They seem more concerned with technology and owning outer space than the political will.

Nuclear arms represent an immediate threat to the existence of human life, giving neither peace nor security, and the myth that weapons are for defence must be exposed at this convention. By their very nature, they are weapons of mutual destruction.

Their deterrent effect is outweighed by the threat to security associated with the growing number of warheads on both sides, the sophistication of delivery systems and the risk of accidents. But still they have not put a stop to it, clinging, as they do, to the illusion they can achieve security through increasing nuclear and conventional forces.

The Canadian Labour Congress wants to free its members, their families and children, from fear of nuclear devastation, from war itself. We love this planet, and we do not want to witness its destruction. This planet must not be used as a home base for those who wish to play Star Wars.

An agreement for both superpowers to abandon the development of weapons in space, either for satellite destruction or for ballistic missile defence, would improve international stability profoundly.

Since time began, people have gazed up at the heavens, seeing not killer satellites or laser platforms. Our early forebears

were terrified by Halley's Comet. Let us make sure that, when it comes back in seventy-six years, our children are still around to see it.

Perhaps, at this point, thought should be given to those children, and their parents, who cannot make it seventy-six days, let alone years, with hunger and disease striking them down daily.

Almost ten years ago, eighteen international statesmen and leaders met in Bonn to begin work on what their Chairman, Willy Brandt, President of the Socialist International, referred to as a plea for change: Peace, Justice, Jobs.

We should remember that they included the then President of the Canadian Labour Congress, Brother Joe Morris.

When he presented the Report of his Independent Commission on International Development issues, Willy Brandt argued that: "The shaping of our common future is much too important to be left to governments and experts alone. Therefore, our appeal goes to youth, to women's and labour movements, to political, intellectual and religious leaders, to scientists and educators, to technicians and managers, to members of the rural and business communities. May they all try to understand and to conduct their affairs in the light of this new challenge."

We think the Canadian Labour Congress has understood, and has tried to promote need for global action in an interdependent world, action to move us rapidly towards global social justice in all our interests.

In the past two years, we have tried to attend trials of workers' leaders in Poland and have protested detention without trial of trade unionists in South Africa.

The unions in that country, many of which have united to create the Congress of South African Trade Unions, whose representatives are here with us today, have sought and received the help of the Canadian Labour Congress. Our help will continue to go to them as they build up their strength and exercise their inalienable rights.

As long as there is one ounce of apartheid remaining in South Africa, the world should never claim victories anywhere. The bloodshed, jailings, murders, injustices and inhumane treatment of these brothers and sisters must end. There is a future for South Africa. There can be peace and happiness. There has to be equality and there has to be one man, one vote. The world should truly be ashamed for what we have allowed.

The rights of our organizations, be they concerning control over our internal activities, or be they concerning our international affiliations, and even our rights as trade unionists, were not given to us as an act of charity, they were won, and sometimes temporarily lost, in hard, continuous battles.

To defend our rights, we have to look more and more to making the democratic political process work for us, and this means, internationally as well as domestically.

We have continually urged the government to limit, suspend or terminate development aid to countries which flagrantly violate basic trade union rights.

Many government ministers or officials are quick to disavow any linkage between human rights and official development assistance. Such simplicity does no justice to anyone.

It should embarrass or surprise no one that, in calling for more aid to post-Somoza Nicaragua, we have particularly encouraged assistance which would help prevent violations of trade union rights and contribute to the pluralistic goals announced by the junta in the triumphant summer of 1979.

Of course, since then, Nicaragua has had to cope with many problems, especially U.S. government-backed destabilization, which we condemn.

The Canadian Labour Congress deeply regrets that the goals of the Nicaraguan people have been frustrated by the so-called Contra war, and the economic destabilization measures of the United States.

We believe that the process of democratic development in Nicaragua can only be further jeopardized by the deliberate military escalation policies of the Reagan administration, and we condemn U.S. aid to the Contras just as we condemn U.S.-sponsored economic strangulation of Nicaragua.

The Canadian Labour Congress has told the government of Canada, and the U.S. administration directly, that the interventionist policies of Reagan in Central America are policies of war and not of peace.

We say that they are policies which increase, not decrease, the suffering of the Nicaragua peoples.

We say that they are policies which deepen international chaos, rather than promote negotiated international settlements such as proposed by the Contadora group of nations.

If Nicaragua is to survive, it is clear that it will require support for the concept of national self-determination, the principle of non-intervention and the fundamental principles of international law.

Canada can and must aggressively promote these policies in Central America and it must openly oppose Ronald Reagan, before he turns all of Central America into a very bad and very bloody Hollywood movie.

Two weeks ago, U.S. war planes struck at Libya in another turn of the wheel of violence.

The events of April 14th make it clear that the world cannot permit the Reagan administration to act unilaterally on the question of terrorism. At the beginning of this year, a statement of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions emphasized that "terrorism is an immediate and growing threat to the safety of workers and their families worldwide." It made the point that the international labour movement should press for "co-ordinated intergovernmental action within the framework of international law to end all forms of terrorism."

The CLC has called for a UN special meeting on terrorism, asking that the UN Secretary-General utilize his office to bring this issue under the auspices of the United Nations. The cycle of violence associated with terrorism, whether it be sponsored by Libya or others, will not be broken by air strikes or rhetorical statements. If a solution is to be found, it can only be through more co-operation and co-ordination amongst UN member-countries in a climate of respect for international law, the UN Charter, and the rights of people everywhere.

Let me close my remarks to you this morning with a review of our multi-faceted agenda for the future — one which is going to test us as we have never been tested before.

We face the ongoing challenge of having to deal with a government committed to programs and policies which shun our concerns and embrace those of the corporations and the financial institutions of this country.

We face major tests of our legitimacy in the courts, a judicial review or our raison d'être.

We face the stone-walling tactics which, hand in hand with greed, prevail in the board rooms of financial institutions and commercial enterprises. The strategy which emanates from these board rooms has, as a single purpose, the denial of proper union representation and collective bargaining rights for the employees of the enterprise.

We face major tests with the community at large.

Finally, we must meet the challenge of peace and contemplate the fragility of our security and our future.

We have no option but to pursue the resolution of these challenges, and we should do so boldly, with courage, with confidence and with solidarity.

Brothers and sisters, I initiated my remarks to you this morning with an appeal for unity. I reiterate that plea as I close. Our work here this week will serve to put in place the foundation for the tasks in the weeks and months ahead, and we will build on that foundation the superstructure which will give life, vigour, and meaning to our Congress.

Let us all commit ourselves to the goal of consensus and understanding. Let us all rededicate ourselves to solidarity, and move ahead in building a better world for ourselves and our children. Let us have peace and unity.

(Standing ovation)

MR. J. MARTIN (USWA): I have a bit of a problem with what is happening outside this Convention. There are leaflets being handed out by the Ontario Provincial Fire Fighters' Association and it is really a concern of mine, given the theme of this convention which is solidarity, unity. Why do we have brothers picketing outside of this hall, when in fact, according to their leaflet — and I will leave it to yourself and the Executive of the CLC to bring back to this Convention an answer — that association of fire fighters were not given an answer to their questions when they were taken out of the CLC. I will leave it to you, Madam Chairperson, but I would like an answer before I leave this Convention this week.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I can answer that now. I have had a meeting with our brothers and it is a commitment I have given to them, and also for those that are within the House of Labour that we shall have a further meeting after the Convention is over to try and work out some of the difficulties. So, the matter has been taken care of. They also indicated to me that they would, in fact, have an information line out there and, of course, I would never have denied that. So it is there and there are meetings arranged for at the conclusion of the Convention and we are going to try and work the differences of opinions out.

It is now my pleasure to declare this Sixteenth Constitutional Convention of the Canadian Labour Congress convened to consider all matters properly before it and I would like to call Michael Lyons forward. I wish to present him with the gavel as a momento of the CLC Convention in Toronto and thank him for his participation in the opening ceremonies.

I now call upon the Chairperson of the Credentials Committee, Ian Reilly, for his first report.

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. I. REILLY (Credentials Committee Chairperson): The Credentials Committee has met and, with a lot of help and perseverance of the delegates and the Canadian Labour Congress staff, we would like to report the following:

Fraternal delegates	3
ICFTU representative	1
Congress Officers	4
Representatives of affiliated organizations	62
Officers and delegates from Federations of Labour and Labour Councils	78
Representatives from affiliated organizations	1,728
Representatives from directly chartered unions	8
Interim total	1,884

I move it on behalf of the Committee.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): It has been moved and seconded that the first report of the Credentials Committee be adopted. Anyone on the question? All in favour of the adoption of the first report of the Credentials Committee. Any opposed. Motion is carried.

MR. J. BELL (Marine Workers' Federation): Point of privilege, Madam Chairperson. The Marine Workers would dearly love to meet with the Chinese delegation while they are in this Convention during the next day or so. We would respectfully ask that you use your office to arrange a meeting between the Chinese delegation and the shipyard workers who are desperately in need of work and we want to talk to them with regard to prospective work. We would appreciate that very much.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We will have a staff person meet you, Brother Bell, as soon as possible about that matter.

I would like now to call on Executive Vice-President Richard Mercier to lead in the observation of the annual day of mourning for workers killed on the job.

ANNUAL DAY OF MOURNING FOR WORKERS KILLED AND INJURED ON THE JOB

MR. R. MERCIER (Executive Vice-President, CLC): Today, we are observing for the first time the Annual Day of Mourning for Workers Killed and Injured on the Job. Several of our affiliated organizations had made a request for this, and April 28 was the date chosen. We also asked municipalities and the federal government to proclaim this day an Annual Day of Mourning and to make it an official event in collaboration with local union organizations.

You are well aware of how serious the problem of occupational diseases and injuries is, all the effort it requires locally and nationally, all the work it means at the level of legislation, negotiations and joint health and safety committees within companies. There have been marked improvements over the past ten years, but there is still plenty of room for progress.

I hope that, throughout this Day of Mourning and the public attention which it attracts, we can achieve a total elimination of workplace injury, disease and death.

For you to better understand the importance of this day, the Canadian Labour Congress has prepared a short video presentation.

Following this presentation, I will ask you to rise and observe one minute of silence in commemoration of the Day of Mourning and also to honour the memory of those of our sisters and brothers who have passed away since we last came together.

We think of the families, relatives and friends of these many fine women and men; we share their loss, we share their grief and we will remember.

(Video presentation on occupational hazards and injuries)

I have just been told that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto has adopted April 28th as a Day of Mourning for injured workers and so has the municipality of St. John's in Newfoundland. That is good news.

We have prepared a leaflet for the Day of Mourning which will be distributed some time this week. Thank you very much for your understanding and support.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I just hope that all delegates will wear your black armbands all day today. This day is declared an official day of recognition and remembrance from here on and for years to come by the Canadian labour movement.

MR. L. KOVACSI (CUPE): Madam Chairperson, I would like to speak to the subject.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): It is not up for debate at this time, brother. Perhaps you can discuss it under the Safety and Health Committee when it reports. This is a moment of solemnity, one which we wish to keep that way for the mourning ceremonies.

MR. T. ROSE (NUPGE-OPSEU): We have a problem at the Convention. In order for some delegates to participate and enjoy

they must smoke; equally for other delegates to enjoy and participate they must not smoke. In light of the seriousness of the subject matter on hand, it is hypocritical for this Convention to condone smoking on the floor. I am very uncomfortable.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I would ask the delegates if you wish to have a cigarette, if you would be considerate of your neighbours and perhaps leave for a few moments.

MS. P.J. CRONKRIGHT (UAW): On the subject of the Day of Mourning, on behalf of my family and myself, I would like to thank you. I lost my father on the job 23 years ago. The government did not want to listen and the film really hits home, and for that purpose and I am sure many more in the room, I thank you for your work.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I appreciate that sister.

MR. B. WARD (CWC): I am alderman for the city council in Brantford. The city of Brantford has officially recognized this as the Day of Mourning for workers killed or injured on the job and hopefully so will other municipalities.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you very much. Now, I think I shall continue on with the order of this morning, the program for the Convention. Before I can do that, I must ask Brother Richard Mercier to chair as I will have to refer committee reports.

CONVENTION PROGRAM

MS. S. CARR (CLC Secretary-Treasurer): The program for the Convention and its procedures are set out in the book that you have received with your kit. The rules of order of business set out in the program are taken directly from the Constitution. I move that the program of business, the rules and order of business and the rules for election, also to be found in your kits, be adopted.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. R. Mercier, Executive Vice-President, CLC): Is there a seconder? Seconded. Any discussion?

MR. L. RUFO (ITU): Mr. Chairperson, my question in regard to the rules and deals with the Constitution, as well as with the program of business. In the rules and order of business, No. 5: "A delegate shall not speak more than once upon a subject until all who wish to speak have had an opportunity to do so". Then No. 6: "A delegate shall not interrupt another except it be to call to a point of order". No. 7: "If a delegate be called to order he/she shall, at the request of the Chairperson, takes his/her seat until the question of order has been decided". Then, there is a question in No. 9: "When a question is put, the Chairperson after announcing the question shall ask: Are you ready for the question?"

My problem is when a delegate calls a question, he should be recognized as well as any other delegate when he speaks on a resolution, whether it be on a point of order or whether it be to refer. In this case, an individual sits down in his/her seat, might call a question and we do not know whether he/she is a delegate. So, therefore, I will ask the Convention as well as the Chair if you will entertain, if a delegate wishes to cease debate, that he/she on a point of order come to a microphone, identify himself or herself, and state his union and local; then you can ask the delegates of this Convention whether or not they wish to cease debate.

MS. S. CARR (Secretary-Treasurer, CLC): We have a very large Convention and we have a great deal of business. We will try to conduct the Convention according to the rules and order of business.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. R. Mercier): Any further discussion? Hearing none, we shall proceed with the vote. Those in favour, please signify by raising your right hand. All those in favour. Down. Opposed. Carried.

MS. S. CARR (Secretary-Treasurer, CLC): You will find in your kits a document entitled "Convention Committees". Listed are 18 Convention Committees which will deal with the various resolutions in the Resolutions Book as well as the Officers' Reports. I move the adoption of the Convention Committees.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. R. Mercier): Is there a supporter? Moved and seconded. Do you have any discussion? No discussion. All those in favour, signify please. Down. Opposed. Carried and so ordered.

MS. S. CARR (Secretary-Treasurer, CLC): I now move that the Solidarity Address, the Report of the Secretary-Treasurer, the Financial Statement and Report of the Executive Council be referred to the Officers' Report Committee.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. R. Mercier): It has been moved and seconded, do you have any discussion? No discussion. All those in favour signify please. Down. Opposed. Carried.

MS. S. CARR (Secretary-Treasurer, CLC): I move the resolutions in the book entitled "Resolutions" be referred to the appropriate committees.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. R. Mercier): It has been moved and seconded. Do we have any discussion? No. All those in favour signify by raising your right hand, please. Down. Opposed. Carried.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee on Human Rights, preceded by a video on human rights.

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE REPORT

MS. H. PLAMONDON (Chairperson, Human Rights Committee): The Human Rights Committee has examined the seven resolutions it received and also Resolution W-22 which came to us from the Women's Committee. The Committee recommends concurrence with Resolution HR-2, which covers Resolution HR-1.

I would now ask Brother Gerry Yetman, President of the Nova Scotia Federation of Labour, to read Resolution HR-2.

MR. G. YETMAN (Human Rights Committee Secretary): Resolution HR-2, which covers 1:

> "WHEREAS the aboriginal peoples of Canada have historically, through broken faith and promises, been denied aboriginal rights including the right to self-determination; and
>
> "WHEREAS the 1983 and the 1984 First Ministers' Constitutional Conferences on Aboriginal Rights have contributed to a better understanding of the aspirations of aboriginal peoples in Canada, there is still one First Ministers' Constitutional Conference on Aboriginal Rights before 1987; and
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we start a dialogue to achieve a better understanding of native issues and rights; and
>
> "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that on the occasion of the next First Ministers' Constitutional Conference on Aboriginal Rights, the Canadian Labour Congress and affiliated unions support the native peoples' rights to:
>
> 1. Self-government;
> 2. Obtaining a provision in the *Constitutional Act* which assures the aboriginal peoples that no amendments affecting their rights can be made without their consent; and
> 3. A just settlement of their claims."

Concurrence on this resolution is moved and seconded by the Committee, Madam Chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence on Resolution No. HR-2. Is there anyone on the question?

MS. L. SPILLETT (ILGWU): I rise to support the Committee's recommendation on this question. Since the moment that

European colonial powers set foot on this continent, the aboriginal peoples of this country have engaged in an historic and courageous struggle for our survival as a nation. At times this struggle took the form of passive resistance and other times our brothers and sisters have taken up arms in the struggle to secure a place of dignity and a place of equality in our own country. The Métis people in Manitoba and across this country celebrated the leaders, both men and women, of that struggle which started in the Red River battle and ended at Batoche; was crushed by the Canadian armed forces; and led also to the execution of its leader, Louis Riel. But native people are still struggling for our rightful place in this country. We have heard and we will hear more at this Convention about one of the most crucial struggles being waged against the most brutal and murderous racist governments in South Africa. We pledge ourselves to do what we can in our own country to help defeat that system. But we must also recognize that the same racist government that keeps the masses of people of colour of South Africa enchained, is the same racist government that have state policies enshrined in their laws to oppress and rid our country of its original people.

Chronic unemployment among native people remains among the highest in Canada; permanent poverty has brought alcohol abuse which, in turn, has resulted in native men and women filling Canadian penitentiaries; the mortality rate among native people is a full ten per cent higher than among other Canadians; our children are the victims of government-run child aid societies in numbers far greater than that of other people in our society. And it makes no matter to people, whether you are black and living in poverty and hopelessness in Soweto or whether you are a native person living in Northern Manitoba or Grassy Narrows, Ontario, or in the urban centres, where native people are forced to live at the edge of society on our main streets, there is no distinction in racism. The tactics may be different but the effects are the same and those who profit from racist policies are also the same whether they be living in South Africa or in Ottawa. In South Africa, colonists just came with the bottle and the Bible and stole the land from the African people. When colonists came to this country, they too stole our land using the Bible and the bottle and threw in a few beads in the exchange. And we are not a defeated people and we will never be a defeated people in our country.

This resolution is important and I hope that we are serious about acting on it. I must again compare our struggle with the struggle of the people in South Africa. There, the people of colour are in the majority and there is no doubt in my mind that they will be victorious and will shake off their oppressors. But we are not the majority in our country any longer; therefore we must hope and support and join with our brothers and sisters in the labour movement. We must ask for assistance and also solidarity. I know that many native people also know that until working people free themselves, that we will also never be free from the oppression that we face. I ask you to keep in mind that while there is a struggle going on in South Africa, that we too are fighting for freedom and equality in this country.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I just want to remind the delegates you have five minutes. There will be a green light on when you start; when you have completed your four minutes the red light will come on and it will stay on for one minute; when it is off, your time is up and I would ask that you respect the time limit.

MR. P. OSMERS (CUPE): I would like to propose a friendly amendment to it. One aspect has been omitted: the right of the natives to control the resources on their land, including the hunting and fishing rights, the licensing of those rights. I propose that there be an additional control of resource rights including the licensing of fishing and hunting that it is under.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee Report has to be referred back on that particular resolution, because of the suggested amendment.

MR. P. OSMERS (CUPE): What would be the procedure to go about that for a friendly amendment?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): You just have to move referral.

MR. P. OSMERS (CUPE): I move referral.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Is it supported? There has been a referral of the Resolution No. 2, there is no debate on the referral. All those in favour of the referral as indicated. All those opposed. The referral is carried.

MR. R. ROLFE (CUPE): Sister Carr's remarks this morning, when she spoke of the legacy of colonialism and racism in the Third World made me think that we ought to bring that home. And this resolution brings that home because there is no question that when we speak of native rights in Canada, it is a question of racism and colonialism.

I am a library worker. I spent last week several days in Timmins, when a workshop was organized for band librarians in Northern Ontario attended by 66 representatives from Indian bands. That was a tremendous success because it was organized by native people themselves and I think that has a bearing here. One of the things that we need to do is no longer talk about native people in terms of their plight or their problems; we should now be speaking of social justice, social equality. The sister who spoke first on the resolution made the point that I think we need to take to heart and remember; that is that native people are not a defeated people, they are not a people of the past. The native community and the Native Council of Canada were represented here this morning. The Assembly of First Nations and other native organizations in Canada all have the strength and resources to see the way through and achieve self-government, achieve rights for themselves. Our role is to listen to them and our role is to support them, and this resolution does that. I think it is very heartening to see it here and I am sure it will get full support.

MS. H. PLAMONDON (Chairperson, Human Rights Committee): Resolution HR-3. We received Resolution W-22 from the Women's Committee and we feel it is covered by Resolution HR-3. The Committee recommends concurrence.

MR. G. YETMAN (Human Rights Committee Secretary):

"WHEREAS racism is rampant in our society as documented by the Urban Alliance in two documents: *Who Gets the Work?* and *No Discrimination Here*; and

"WHEREAS women in general are subject to discrimination and visible minority women are subject to even more discrimination because of their ethnicity; and

"WHEREAS labour has addressed itself in combatting racism;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress, in keeping with its mandate of equality for women, take concrete action for visible minority women, including:

1. Education
   a) for all membership on racism;
   b) special workshops for visible minority women and men;
2. Documentation of various aspects of racism in our workplaces;
3. Promote the incorporation of protective language and on-site courses on cross-cultural studies in our collective agreements; and
4. Encourage affiliates to translate their collective agreements and major documents into languages which will be understood by their membership."

Concurrence in this resolution has been moved and seconded by the Committee.

MR. A. HERSCHOVITCH (Vice-President, OFL): I wish to remind this Convention that we in the Ontario Federation of Labour have carried on an intensive campaign to deal with this question. We feel that not enough is being done; we feel that the unions themselves have a large section of visible minorities. Today the

labour movement has a cross-section of every nationality we can think of, and we are proud of that. But we have to make every effort to involve these people in the life of our union. That cross-section of the labour movement is not really represented in the manner that they should be.

Just recently we had a conference of visible minorities, which was very successful; and we are suggesting that the CLC undertake a particular campaign, in order to make a success of this entire program. The Human Rights Committee of the CLC must take the initiative in leading the entire labour movement in order to open the doors, show these people, the people who are not as yet feeling comfortable within the ranks of the labour movement, that they are welcome and that every opportunity must be given and will be given to them to get involved in the life of our organization.

MR. S. WHARTON (Steelworkers): I rise in support of the resolution. If we are going to be very frank and candid about the decisions we make in accepting recommendations and voting in favour of resolutions such as this, we have to go a little bit further in carrying out some action. Presently there is a strike, being waged by a local union of the Communications Workers' union against a company called "Super Plastics" in Mississauga. The workers are engaged in a battle that has been lasting for the past nine months. Members of the Sikh community, many East Asians, are involved in this strike. I would like to propose a recognition of the battles that these people are fighting right now at some point during this Convention. I have seen it happen in the past at the OFL Conventions. I would like to see this Convention meet and assure some solidarity, some support for these strikers by organizing a mass picket at this plant in Mississauga sometime during this week.

MS. C. SCEVIOUR (Steelworkers): Many of us over the years have seen ways that the employers bust unions; and racism in the workplace is union-busting. It erodes our solidarity, it erodes our strength and it erodes our support. It is fine for us to come to conventions and urge either the OFL or the CLC to put on educational programs and use translations, but at this point I would like to put a challenge to the delegates here. First of all, support this resolution but go back to your locals and go back to your affiliates as well and do your job there to build your union and make it strong.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you very much. I don't see anyone else at the mike, are you ready for the question to be put? All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence, show your hands. Any opposed? The motion is carried.

MS. H. PLAMONDON (Chairperson, Human Rights Committee): The Committee recommends concurrence in Resolution HR-4.

MR. G. YETMAN (Human Rights Committee Secretary):

"WHEREAS hate literature, racist and ethnic jokes still are circulated in organized and unorganized workplaces, including government offices;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress denounce these practices, and take an active role to raise members' awareness of how harmful this practice can be, so that dignity and justice will prevail in our community."

The recommendation of the Committee is of concurrence, moved and seconded.

MR. T. O'CONNOR (CUPE): Over the years, we have passed resolutions and policies and adopted campaigns on human rights. Yet, here we are having to pass a resolution saying we are opposed to racist jokes and racist literature. And we need it, because everyone knows that these things are happening. The jokes are said and people laugh; the literature and cartoons are passed around and people laugh; so we still have to pass the resolution. It is a scandal that we have to do that, that it is still necessary. People say, how do you sort of nicely object to somebody passing around a cartoon or how do you nicely object to somebody telling a racist joke or an ethnic joke? Well, the fact is there is no nice way to object to it. You have to just say: "That is wrong. I take exception to that and I do not want to hear it, thank you."

The fact that we have a resolution such as this after all the campaigns and committees sort of indicates that we have been a little complacent; maybe we thought we had done it maybe ten years ago or twenty years ago and we have not. When you get back home, think about this a little bit and maybe it is time that you activated a Human Rights Committee in your local, in your affiliate, in your labour council, in your area council or whatever it is you are here from. Do something about getting an educational campaign going; do something about raising the issue of human rights because we have never won that battle once and for all. I would finally urge the brothers and sisters when they go back home to take some individual responsibility. The next time you see somebody with an ethnic cartoon or a racist cartoon or somebody wants to tell you just one more Newfie joke, raise your voice and just say right there and then, no matter how hard it is, say: "Sorry, I do not wish to hear that."

MS. P. SANDERSON (NUPGE-BCGEU): I have a point of information actually. When I read this resolution and subsequently in the following year read the proceedings, I am afraid I am going to be lost in knowing what it is about. In fact, I would like to say that perhaps we should not denounce these practices but maybe should substitute the words "racist practices". Am I correct in that?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): No sister, I think we already are talking about that in the resolution.

MS. P. SANDERSON (NUPGE-BCGE): But the "Therefore be it resolved" is actually only what will appear.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): No, it will not, the "Whereas" is there too. The whole resolution is adopted, the "whereases" and the "therefore".

MR. R. SLAGHT (UE): I have for most of my life prided myself in my non-racial attitudes, attitudes which the majority of people in this room would probably support as you probably support this resolution. However, early this year I attended a course here in Toronto sponsored by the Ontario Federation of Labour, on Racial Discrimination in the Workplace. During that week, one thing became painfully clear to me; just how much my own actions, no matter how innocent, were in fact very harmful in terms of shaping attitudes on racism. I, for many years, had told and listened to racial jokes. I meant no harm by it, but nonetheless my actions were very insensitive and harmful in shaping bad attitudes. I am glad to say that I decided that I will no longer be a part of this. I hope all of you here will take a look at your own actions and decide to join with me and not take part in the racial jokes.

MR. D. GALVIN (CUPE): The previous resolutions that have been brought forward are going to indicate to this Convention the strength and the job that is necessary for us as trade unionists. We can no longer consider the word "complacency" because that word is a challenge to us to get rid of it. The only challenge before us is the unity, cohesiveness, strength and energy needed to take back to our locals, to our provinces, to show that we can link our hands together. We are saying that there are two million people involved, if each of us linked our hands together, there should be enough energy and wisdom and knowledge within that strength to perhaps light the lights of Toronto or Ottawa or Montreal, to show the governments within this country of Canada that the labour movement is here to stay.

MR. K. POWEL (ACTWU): I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak on this resolution and probably a few more things that I have heard. I have the personal experience of many of

these things that are being talked about; so I should refer to these things as a disgrace. We live in a modern society and a modern age and we think of ourselves as being intelligent. Yet, at my workplace, racism is stealing the hell out of us there, ethnic people. I do not know really what to say. Time after time I come to conventions and these things are brought up. We hope that, from now on, some stiff restrictions may be put in place to curb the situation. It brings discomfort, it brings stress, and it makes you feel uncomfortable. I am calling upon the labour movement to do all their best to be clear about our old war on these things.

Right now, I have a case with the Human Rights Commission, at my workplace (Masdan Carpets), it is one of the most uncomfortable and the worst place for anyone to work in this country. The only reason why I work at this place is just because of unemployment, because a job is so hard to get.

Join together and help those who are in this situation, so that this thing may be completely eliminated out of this wonderful country; help out some of our own young intelligent people.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I do not see any others, are you read for the question now? All those in favour of adopting the Committee's recommendation of concurrence. Any opposed. Carried.

It is now adjournment time.

I would now ask the Committee to step down now. Thank you very much, we will see you at 2:00 o'clock.

The Convention adjourned for lunch at 12:31 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1986
Afternoon Session

CLC Secretary-Treasurer Shirley Carr called the Convention to order at 2:05 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): You will recall this morning it was agreed that Jay Naidoo would speak, our brother from the Congress of South African Trade Unions. During the noon hour a letter was placed on your tables asking you to join the campaign against the laws used by the South African regime to control the movement of the majority of the people. The regime has changed some of the laws but has not recognized freedom of movement. The protest campaign continues. Please read the letter and join the campaign which is supported by COSATU. The story of this super-federation can best be told by its own representatives; and here also to listen to what our brothers have to say is the Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada, also a member of the Commonwealth Committee that is studying this problem, Ted Scott.

James Naidoo is the General Secretary of the Congress of South African Trade Unions, COSATU. Previously, General Secretary of the Sweet, Food and Allied Worker's Union and before that a union organizer in his community. Educated at the University of Durban, Westville, where he was a student activist, he now works out of the COSATU main office in Johannesburg. It is a great, great pleasure and honour to introduce to you Jay Naidoo.

ADDRESS BY JAY NAIDOO
General Secretary, Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU)

MR. J. NAIDOO (General Secretary, COSATU): An important fact that has been left out in my introduction is that I am known as what is classically known in South Africa as a "university drop-out".

I wish to thank you for the opportunity you have given me to address this Convention. Standing in my place should have been the president of our federation, Elijah Barayi. He has been refused a passport for the third time. We have a very simple slogan in South Africa. In Zulu, it means "the power is ours" and that is the way people, the oppressed majority in South Africa see the situation today.

Today, we are seeing our country devastated by a regime and a system of cheap labour that has a total disregard for human life and human values. We are seeing the enormous wealth and resources of our country used to build a minority class of wealth unrivalled in this world and a military machinery that keeps in check the oppressed majority and destabilizes our sub-continent. Today, more than 18 million people in the Southern African Continent live under the sword of apartheid. My personal experience in the past week will bring home to you the tragedy that has befallen our country. Jeffrey Balani, a senior vice-president of a COSATU affiliate, a committed trade unionist for many years, who chose to join COSATU to fight for our rights, was brutally attacked on Tuesday night by armed thugs. He was shot in the arm, his house was burned down and his brother was seriously injured. Moses Maikiso, another committed activist in COSATU living in a city 500 km. away, returned home the same night to find an armed band of thugs had come looking for him and had said very openly they had come to kill him. He had just come out of several months of detention.

These are our daily experiences which have forged the unshakable unity, that we have seen in the formation of COSATU. It has taken four years of painstaking, democratic discussion to launch a federation that has given us a presence to every major industrial concentration in the country; a federation which at its formation was 500,000 strong, which today is 650,000 strong. But although COSATU is still a relatively new organization, it is built on the traditions of militant worker resistance that has come before it: from the Industrial Commercial Union, in 1919, through to SACTU in the 1950s. But the task that faces us is enormous. Millions have to be organized; the necessary infrastructure and power has to be consolidated at the local, regional and national level. But we are learning from the militant sections of our community. We are learning from the unity and action of progressive groups and we are learning from the interaction with our sisters and brothers here in Canada and in other parts of the world.

The crisis facing my country is gigantic. It is clear to us that the apartheid regime and big business are incapable of resolving this crisis which has become deeper in the structure. Our economy is devastated. More than three million people are unemployed. We have an inflation rate of about 20 per cent. The attempt by the apartheid state to introduce sham political reform has initiated the massive and sustained resistance that our country has seen over the last eighteen months. The rallying cry of the oppressed has become that apartheid cannot be reformed, it must be buried now. And it is clear that, in order to do this, the people must find the solutions in themselves and in the organizations that they have built.

COSATU, as you well know, has taken an explicitly political position from its beginning; for us non-political unionism is not only undesirable, it is impossible. We are the producers of the wealth and, in order that the interests of the working class are advanced, workers will have to play a leading role in the struggle for total liberation. Our position has, of course, precipitated an attack on us by the apartheid regime. A key component of this attack was the reaction of the INKHATA organization, a movement that is linked to the Kwazulu Bantustan and Natal. The attack is posed at the propaganda level in three ways and I will spend a short time expanding on these, because there may be similar misconceptions that exist in various quarters, particularly in the Western governments.

We have been called a friend of ANC. This shows how little the understanding of democratic control in a democratic trade union operates. Our policy directions reflect the aspirations of our members and are taken in democratic structures in which

there is a majority of workers from the factory floor. But our commitments — to bury apartheid, to secure the release of Nelson Mandela and all political prisoners, to secure the unbanning of banned organizations such as the ANC and SACTU, to support the demands of our militant students for their own representative councils and for an education that does not perpetuate slavery — have brought us into common cause with a number of different organizations opposed to apartheid.

Undoubtedly, the most important of these is the African National Congress, a mass-based movement that is growing in strength daily in South Africa. On the basis of this understanding, COSATU sent an official senior delegation to meet with the ANC and SACTU, something that would have been impossible earlier and something that today is indicative of the growing political stand of our organizations in South Africa. We have issued an official communiqué in our discussions that clarified the task that organizations such as the ANC, COSATU and SACTU have set themselves, a process that we believe will strengthen our struggle since we have stated that there is no contradiction in the separate existence of SACTU and COSATU. It is important to recognize that the unity of all progressive organizations is essential to defeat apartheid and that will need the full support of the international trade union movement.

We have, secondly, been accused of being opposed to the present economic system in South Africa and we have said openly that we are opposed to it. Anyone who accepts it certainly does not have the interest of the working class at hand. What we have said is that the present system is based on the disposition by a racist minority of the land; the fact that 75 per cent of the population is limited to only 13 per cent of the land in poverty-stricken reserves called Bantustans; the fact that today the black majority is denied the fundamental political franchise that you take for granted; the fact that today in one of the wealthiest countries in the world we have approximately four children dying of malnutrition every day, obviously they are black; the fact that from 1915 to 1985 we have had 18 million people prosecuted for breaking laws that control the movement in the land of their birth, obviously they are also black. The cause, as we understand it, is the ruthless pursuit of super-profits by the hungry monopolies, both South African and foreign. Our struggle for freedom therefore involves not only a form of political democracy but a struggle for a society free from the chains of poverty, racism and exploitation. We believe that this will incorporate our struggle for a new society, will incorporate a fundamental restructuring of our economy. We will need your solidarity in the future society as much as we need it today, to rebuild our country.

At the third level we have been attacked for causing loss of jobs, by our support for the disinvestment campaign. This is what we call "bullshit" in South Africa! We believe that the real havoc has been wreaked by the bankruptcy of the political and economic policies of the apartheid regime. We believe, further, that Reagan's constructive engagement is a policy that engages not the democratic majority but props up a racist minority. The extension of its reactionary policies by support of the South African movement, UNITA, has committed the U.S. administration together with South Africa to a policy of destabilization in the sub-continent. But we have the greatest respect for the democrats of the labour movement and among the people of America who have shown by the demonstrations where their real hearts are.

To sum up the feelings of the majority of people in South Africa, let me quote an American patriot that Reagan chose to ignore. He said: "To say that disinvestment puts blacks out of jobs is to say that you cannot end slavery because the slaves will not have jobs." As a COSATU shop steward put it: "Foreign bosses must leave with what they came. They must leave with their coats because we have built the mines, the shops, the factories and they belong to us." We at COSATU have further called for intensification of all forms of international pressure if the Botha regime remains intransigent. The daily killings, which today they put at 1,400 in the last 18 months, but which, unofficially we know is exceeded by many hundreds, show us that they are and have remained intransigent to the demands of the democratic majority. But not only that, they have now intensified the cycle of violence against the peace-loving democrats of our own country.

Finally, as a representative of COSATU and my people, we call for direct bilateral and other forms of assistance to be given to us in the time of our greatest need. We need the closest possible links to show the Botha regime that Canadian workers will act against the brutal excesses of an inherently evil system of apartheid exploitation. It is no exaggeration today that your help could mean the difference between life and death for thousands of workers, their children and the people in South Africa. We need your political, financial, material and moral support. More important to us, we want to see here today that our struggle is your struggle, a struggle for democracy, justice and liberty. Many of you in the CLC, in the affiliates, in the locals have done this already. We salute you and we urge that all of you share the burden that many of us carry already. In the near future we will build a new society, we will take our rightful place in the family of nations and we will eradicate forever the festering fault of racism that today infests the body of humanity. And finally, sisters and brothers, we wish to thank you again and we wish you well. It is only through the unity of the working class that will eventually rid the world of the present evils and I am sure that Canadian workers will play their rightful role.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I know that the delegates will take that message home. The reason that the COSATU brothers have to leave early is because on May Day, there will be massive demonstrations and they have also heard that there is some considerable threat to the lives of the labour leaders and they want to be there to try to quell that.

We will now carry on with the order of business and that is dealing with the whole question of the Free Trade, Deregulation and Privatization Policy Statement of the Executive Council. I now call upon Brother Dick Martin to start.

MR. D. MARTIN (Executive Vice-President, CLC): Before we commence the reading of the document, there will be a video that will talk about the issue that we are about to debate.

OUR CANADA OR THEIRS? WORKERS CONFRONT THE CORPORATION BLUEPRINT (1986 statement on Free Trade, Deregulation and Privatization)

MR. D. MARTIN (Executive Vice-President, CLC):

"By supporting a comprehensive free trade agreement with the United States, deregulation and privatization, the current government has defined its position in the Canadian economy with perfect clarity. Its roots are firmly planted in corporate Canada and it has nothing but disdain for the working people of Canada.

"Each of these policies will mean job losses at precisely the time when the restoration of full employment must be the number one priority for Canadian workers.

"Each of these policies will undermine wages and working conditions when governments should be trying to improve the living standards of all Canadians.

"Each of these policies will transfer power and authority from the public political sphere, to the private corporate sphere, at a time when corporate reorganizations are throwing people out of work, and the corporate sector is waging unprecedented attacks on the trade union movement.

"Each of these policies means throwing away the tools of economic management at a time when those tools must be applied with full force to:

- Restore full employment;

- Improve living standards for all;
- Provide a fair distribution of income and wealth; and
- Protect the Canadian community from the excesses to which the pursuit of profit always gives rise.

"Underlying each of these policies — free trade, deregulation and privatization — is a common philosophy. This philosophy unites the three policies and makes them separate reflections of a single corporate view of the world.

"According to this philosophy, the well-being of Canadians will be best insured if businesses are free to pursue their self-interest without reference to the common good; the common good will result as the unintended consequence of businesses pursuing their self-interest in the competitive market place. Within this philosophy, government is reduced to the role of a passive bystander that merely sets the rules for the market competitors. Government has little or no role to play in taking action to insure that positive social and economic objectives are achieved.

"There is nothing new in this philosophy. It is a philosophy that dominated the discussion of public affairs in Canada and other industrialized countries prior to World War II. It is a philosophy that has been tried and tested in practice, and — most importantly — it has been found wanting.

"Every country that has experienced the unbridled pursuit of self-interest in the market place has discovered important truths about the negative consequences of this strategy;

- It did not provide continuing prosperity and full employment;
- It did not produce a publicly acceptable distribution of income and wealth;
- It did not protect the environmental legacy that would be left to succeeding generations;
- It did not provide reasonable economic opportunities to people in disadvantaged regions or to people who were disadvantaged by reasons of gender, race, or nationality; and
- It did not meet individual and community needs unless meeting those needs produced a profit, and it did respond to the luxurious and often trivial demands of the rich.

"Not surprisingly, in every country that has experienced the unbridled free market, people have demanded government measures to curb its negative effects and to meet needs to which the market did not respond. In Canada, Unemployment Insurance, Medicare, Old Age Security and the Canada Pension Plan have been put in place to offset the market's unfair distribution of income and wealth. Regional development and affirmative action programs have been demanded because the market cannot provide equal opportunities for all. Government regulation has been introduced to protect the community from the excesses to which the market gives rise.

"In other countries people have not stopped at demanding that the negative effects of the market be curbed. They have rid themselves of governing parties that espouse the corporate view of the world and put democratic socialist governments in place that subordinate the pursuit of profit to the public good. We, in Canada, must follow their example.

"Free trade, deregulation and privatization will make Canada a leaner and meaner place to live. These policies force Canadians to abandon the use of our democratic political institutions to shape our futures. They demand that we give up our efforts to protect the weaker members of the community, to protect the environment, to provide universal public services, and even to engage in nation-building itself. All of these traditional elements in Canadian public policy are to be abandoned in the hope that the pursuit of corporate self-interest in the market place will do what it has never done in the past — provide continuing prosperity, full employment and a fair distribution of income and wealth.

"The battle over these policies will be a battle between two conflicting views of the world. The mean-spirited, market-dominated view of the corporate world will be countered by a workers' agenda that puts priority on a planned, compassionate economy and society that meets the need of people.

"We must win this battle, we will win this battle.

"We will mobilize the entire labour movement and make common cause with other groups to defeat free trade, deregulation and privatization; to expose the callousness of the right-wing corporate philosophy that underlies them; to rid ourselves of the governments that endorse these policies and this philosophy.

"Each of these policies will be looked at in turn.

A Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with the United States

"Despite its refusal to debate the issue during the 1984 election, the current government announced its intention to negotiate a comprehensive free trade agreement with the United States almost immediately on taking office. The mutual nature of this commitment was confirmed at the so-called Shamrock Summit in March 1985. The intention of the government was to implement this proposal with a minimum of public discussion. If this was the government's intention, it is an intention that cannot be met.

"The Canadian Labour Congress and other progressive organizations have criticized the proposal from the beginning. Public opinion is increasingly opposed to it. Provincial governments have expressed their strong reservations about the proposal and have successfully demanded that they have some input into the negotiations. Spokespersons for the Canadian and U.S. governments have been contradicting each other on what is negotiable in free trade talks, and the Prime Minister and other members of Cabinet have become increasingly shrill in their attacks on the critics of free trade.

"The government's attempt at a low key approach to negotiating a free trade deal with the U.S. is unravelling at the seams. Nonetheless, the Prime Minister had made it clear that he still intends to pursue the issue and we will remain equally steadfast in our opposition to a comprehensive free trade deal.

"According to the defenders of free trade, what would be involved in a free trade deal is creation of a 'level playing field' between the two countries. Corporations will be free to buy and sell across the border as if no border existed, and governments will refrain from giving preference to producers in one country versus the other.

"Philosophically a free trade agreement with the U.S. is just another reflection of the faith in the market that permeates government thinking in both countries. However, some specific circumstances have added to the pressure to strike such a deal.

"The value of both the U.S. and Canadian dollars have been increasing compared to other world currencies in recent years. For Canada this has meant that an increasing share of our total trade has been with the U.S. For the U.S. it has meant increasing trade deficits and increasing pressures in the U.S. Congress to introduce protectionist measures. Thus, one of the main reasons offered for striking a free trade deal is that it may allow Canada to avoid the effect of protectionist measures.

"This rationale totally misses the point. The protectionist sentiment in the U.S. reflects an over-valued U.S. dollar and this circumstance may not persist over a long period of time.

"More importantly, the protectionist sentiments should remind Canadians that, from the U.S. point of view, Canada is a foreign country. And there is no way to bind future generations of U.S. voters and politicians to a trade deal that does not work to their advantage. Even in the current context, the U.S. government seems less interested in a free trade deal with Canada as an end in itself, than it is using such a deal to soften resistance to the demands it wants to make of other countries in multilateral negotiations.

"It is extremely important to note that the negotiations on a free trade pact will be taking place in a situation in which tariffs between the two countries are already low and are declining.

"By 1987, more than 70 per cent of all trade between the two countries will be totally free of tariffs under existing trade arrangements. Therefore, negotiations will focus less on tariffs than on non-tariff barriers to trade. (Non-tariff barriers are government measures that are viewed as giving a preference to producers of goods and services in one country versus their foreign competitors; they are departures from the concept of the level playing field;)

"Even under existing trade arrangements, the U.S. has complained that Unemployment Insurance benefits for fishermen, stumpage fees in the forest industries, agricultural marketing boards, and regulated natural gas prices are non-tariff barriers to trade. Therefore, special tariffs have been recommended on the import of these Canadian goods to the U.S.

"In negotiating a comprehensive free trade agreement with the U.S., a wide range of economic management tools will definitely be challenged by the U.S. on the grounds that they are non-tariff barriers to trade. Regional development grants, agricultural support programs, government procurement (purchasing) programs that favour Canadian industry, Canadian content rules in broadcasting are important cases in point. Other items may be challenged as well, such as the production and job safeguards in the Canada-U.S. auto pact and subsidies to the artistic and cultural industries. Even social programs like medicare could be challenged as a non-tariff barrier to trade if they are viewed as giving Canadian producers a competitive advantage over their U.S. competitors.

"In short, what will be on the negotiating table in Canada-U.S. free trade talks are the tools of national economic management. Thus if we want to use grants and public investment to overcome the regional economic disparities between the Atlantic provinces and the rest of Canada, or to diversify the manufacturing base of Western Canada, we will have to get U.S. agreement that these measures do not involve non-tariff barriers to trade. If we want to use grants and regulations to preserve Canadian ownership in the communications industry and to insure the vitality of Canadian cultural industries, we will also need U.S. agreement that these measures do not involve non-tariff barriers to trade. In short, a comprehensive free trade agreement with the U.S. will limit Canada's scope for independent political action. Canada's economic, political and cultural sovereignty is at stake in this issue, no matter what the Prime Minister and his colleagues might say to the contrary.

"Furthermore, initiatives such as deregulation, privatization and the threatened attack on agricultural marketing boards, which are incredibly important in their own right, must also be seen as part of a process of establishing the basis for a free trade deal. They are all designed to level the playing field.

"If the government proceeds to implement a Canada-U.S. free trade deal, pressures to copy the U.S. way of doing things will also come from Canadian businesses. They will apply the level playing field argument with particular vigour and insist that they not be put at a disadvantage compared to the U.S. competitors with regard to everything from the taxes they pay to: labour standards and collective bargaining legislation; environmental regulations; health and safety laws; and affirmative action programs. The level playing field argument will also be used at the bargaining table — especially in the U.S. multinationals. Canadian workers will be told that they must accept U.S. wage and benefit packages or production will be moved to the U.S.

"Free trade with the United States will also reinforce the general movement to reduce the size of government services to U.S. levels, and public sector workers will face increased layoffs. It is likely too that U.S. firms that provide services to U.S. governments on a 'contracting-out' basis will insist that they be allowed to do so in Canada too.

"Although the government sector in the U.S. is smaller than in Canada — compared to the size of the economy — its military budget is much larger. This is important because government expenditures on national security have been exempted from existing international accords dealing with non-tariff barriers to trade. If this model is applied to a Canada-U.S. free trade agreement, the U.S. will still be free to use its $240 billion military budget to subsidize industrial research and development and other economic objectives, while the Canadian programs designed for non-military purposes may be in contravention of the agreement.

"In Canada the problems involved in trying to create a level playing field are compounded by the reality that many key sectors of the Canadian economy are dominated by U.S.-owned multinationals. In many cases the Canadian branch plants were designed specifically to serve the Canadian market that was protected by a tariff. Thus the Canadian branch plants were often not equipped with the research and development capability that would allow them to compete in an international market. In the face of a Canada-U.S. free trade agreement, the rationale for Canadian production may disappear altogether.

"At this stage of Canada's history no economic and social issue is more important than the restoration of full employment. Yet, on this score, free trade promises to be a disaster. Substantial short-term losses are virtually guaranteed in a number of industrial sectors such as: brewing, the home appliance industry, petrochemicals, food processing and clothing and textiles. Corporate organization will increasingly dominate the agricultural sector and family farmers will be forced to seek work in other sectors of the economy. Moreover, while the government of Canada refuses to make public the studies it has done on economic impact of free trade, the government of Ontario has released a study showing that 281,000 manufacturing jobs are highly vulnerable under a free trade pact. The leaked conclusion of a Quebec government study suggests that 455,000 jobs in that province may be lost.

"A free trade agreement will be certain to aggravate our unemployment problems in the near future with no assurance of compensation job increases in the long term.

"On the other side of the debate, what evidence does the current government use to demonstrate that free trade will benefit Canadian workers? The answer: nothing. They hide whatever studies they have done. For them it is purely ideological leap of faith: the free continent market will save us.

"The case against entering into a comprehensive free trade agreement is clear:

- It guarantees severe economic dislocation;
- It will force Canada to abandon traditional tools of economic management; and
- It will undermine our economic, political and cultural sovereignty.

"The risks involved in entering a comprehensive free trade agreement with the U.S. are enormous. In a worst case situation the Canadian economy will be restructured to accommodate such an agreement and the U.S. will back out at a later date. The U.S. cannot be bound indefinitely to an agreement that is not working to their advantage and they appear to have ulterior motives for negotiating an agreement. They want to soften European and Japanese resistance to the demand that no-tariff barriers be reduced on a multilateral basis. Canada-U.S. trade means much less to them than it does to us.

"Furthermore, increasing trade dependency with the U.S. may limit our scope to follow an independent course in the wider field of international affairs.

"If the case against a comprehensive free trade agreement with the United States is clear, so is the need to set trade policy

in its proper perspective. Trade policy — like all particular economic policies — must be recognized as an important subordinate part of an economic strategy that is designed to provide full employment, a high and rising standard of living for all Canadians, and a more equal distribution of income and wealth.

"An economic strategy that is going to meet these objectives must address the problem of the lack of strength and diversity of the Canadian manufacturing sector. It must strengthen domestic industries and markets through mechanisms such as: Canadian content rules; import replacement programs; domestic procurement programs of governments and crown corporations; industrial offset programs and measures to increase industrial research and development.

"In context, a planned approach to trade policy can and must be taken. A planned approach must have the objective of reducing our overwhelming dependence on the U.S. as a trading partner. This objective demands a diversification of our significant differences in the competitiveness of different Canadian industries. Both multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations must be approached on a sectoral basis and job and production guarantees must be accepted as a necessary part of any agreement.

"The point of such an approach is not to be isolationist, nor is it to be anti-American. The point of such an approach is to establish Canada as a viable economic entity over which Canadians can exercise a reasonable degree of control through our democratic political institutions. It is an approach which is designed to allow Canadians to choose their economic future rather than have it imposed on them as a result of businesses pursuing their self-interest in a continental market.

Deregulation

"Since taking office the current government has substantially gutted the Foreign Investment Review Act and Agency and replaced it with Investment Canada; it has scrapped the National Energy Program; it has announced its intention to pursue the deregulation of the transportation sector; it has proposed substantial deregulation of the financial sector; it has loosened the regulation of the food processing sector, and it has identified the following industries as being over-regulated: fisheries, agriculture, construction, forestry, mining and energy.

"Moreover, on February 13, 1986, the government announced a comprehensive 'regulatory reform strategy' that will touch all aspects of regulation. In announcing this strategy the Deputy Prime Minister said that the strategy 'makes clear our intention to tilt the regulatory emphasis in the direction of economic efficiency, market flexibility and personal freedom' as opposed to 'public protection and community values'. Clearly deregulation is the order of the day.

"The current federal government is not alone in promoting deregulation. The former government was heavily into this act too. It asked the Economic Council of Canada in 1978 to advise it how to reduce 'the burden' of government regulation on the economy and it initiated transport deregulation. At the provincial level, conservative governments have also pushed deregulation. Characteristically, the government of British Columbia has led the way with its grotesque attack on the provincial Human Rights Commission.

"The move toward deregulation is being driven by the right-wing philosophy noted above. Within this view, regulation is an unnecessary burden on private business and the benefits of regulation to the community are simply ignored. The move to deregulate specific industries has been also spurred on by the emergence of businesses that want to enter regulated industries and also by established companies that see the opportunity for increased profits in a deregulated environment. The successful attack on the regulation of transportation and communications industries in the U.S. has added to the pressure to do likewise here in Canada.

"The threat posed by deregulation varies depending on the specific body of regulation that is under attack. The abolition of labour standards or human rights legislation has different implications (exploitation of the weak), than does the elimination of fisheries regulations (the destruction of a common resource), or the elimination of consumer protection legislation (the potential for defrauding consumers and tins of rancid tuna on the supermarket shelves).

"Despite this variety, most government regulation reflects popular concerns that, if businesses are free to pursue their self-interest without reference to the common good, they will impose burdens on other people for which those other people cannot or should not have to pay. This is true whether one is dealing with the degradation of the environment in the absence of environmental protection legislation, or the abuse of monopoly power in the absence of anti-combines and consumer protection legislation. To declare a general bias against regulation — as the current government has done — is to give licence to businesses to impose costs on the community. The Deputy Prime Minister got the issue right; in the field of regulation we are looking at conflicts between 'market flexibility' and community protection. Unfortunately he got the conclusion wrong. Recent events — such as the rancid tuna affair; bank and trust company collapses, and PCB spills — remind us of the constant need to protect the community against the excesses and the negligence that accompany the quest for profit.

"In the case of the transportation and communications industries, it is important to note that regulation has been an important element in nation-building. Regulations have been established to insure the existence of high quality, national, East-West networks to which all Canadians will have access at reasonable prices. Within the regulatory frameworks, prices have been set to insure that people living in regions that are less well populated do not face excessive prices when they use transportation or communication services. An additional concern of regulation in the transportation sector has been to insure the safety of passengers, workers and people who live adjacent to transportation routes.

"The U.S. experience with deregulation in the airline, trucking, rail and bus industries should cause grave concern about following a similar approach here. Smaller communities have faced either a total loss of service or reduced service and fares have increased on less well-travelled routes. Furthermore, it is difficult to ignore the possibility that the recent increase in plane crashes in the U.S. is the result of deregulation, as new operators try to break into the market using old equipment, and competitive pressures lead to scrimping on maintenance costs. Ironically, too, while deregulation was justified as a way of opening up the market to new competitors, deregulation has led to an increased dominance of the airline and trucking industries by a few large competitors. Through all of this, 460,000 jobs have been lost and workers have been forced to accept substantial concessions in their collective agreements.

"In the communications sector, local phone rates have increased 30 per cent to 50 per cent in the U.S. under deregulation. Free calling areas have been shrinking in size and long distance rates between smaller cities have increased. In addition, consumers find that they no longer have one phone company to deal with. Now they have to deal with separate companies that provide the equipment, the local phone service and the long distance service. The result is aggravation, inconvenience and expense.

"Because of Canada's sparse population and enormous land mass, the potential problems with deregulation in these vital sectors are much greater. In the absence of regulation it is difficult to imagine national transportation and communications networks surviving. Canadian cities will likely be reduced to the status of

Northern spokes on larger U.S. wheels in a continental system of transportation and communication.

"A rational approach to regulation cannot begin by assuming — as the current government has — that deregulation is necessary. Each body of regulation must be assessed on its own merits and full account must be taken not only of the economic costs of regulation, but of the social and economic benefits as well. In some cases an even-handed assessment of this sort may lead to the conclusion that a relaxation of regulations is in order. However, it is just as likely that such an assessment would lead to the conclusion that stiffer regulations are in order. Certainly the legislative agenda of the CLC provides many examples of problem areas in the Canadian economy and society that require more, not less, regulation. Pensions, labour standards legislation, environmental protection and affirmative action provide important cases in point.

"A rational approach to regulation must also take account of wider economic goals such as full employment and a high and rising standard of living for all. If deregulation is in conflict with these goals it must be opposed.

"This is particularly important in the case of regulated industries. Employers both inside and outside the regulated industries can see that deregulation will undermine the bargaining power of all workers. For them, deregulation is part of a broader strategy to attack wages and working conditions. We are equally clear in understanding this point; it deepens our resolve to fight the deregulation of specific industries.

"The obsession of conservative governments with the so-called burden of regulation will also deflect attention from the real problems in the field of regulation that affect working people such as:

- The lack of openness in the process of framing regulations that affect working people;
- The slow process of consolidating legislation and regulations;
- The lack of adequate enforcement of various bodies of regulation;
- The difficulty the many groups have in making representations to regulatory tribunals; and
- Making patronage appointments to regulatory bodies.

"It would be foolhardy to say that there are no problems in the area of government regulation. But the problem does not lie in the so-called total burden of regulation and the solution most emphatically does not lie in deregulation.

"If governments want to make improvements in the field of regulation, they can begin by:

- Acting on the advice they get from the trade union movement on needed regulation;
- Intensifying their efforts to make people aware of their rights under regulations;
- Increasing the staff that has to enforce regulations; and
- Stop assigning worn-out political hacks to regulatory bodies.

Privatization

"Privatization has three distinct aspects:

1. Selling Crown corporations and other Crown property to private owners;
2. Substituting the purchase of services from private firms for the provision of services by government employees (i.e. contracting-out); and
3. Governments refusing to provide certain services so that the private sector can provide them.

"Both big and small 'c' conservative governments at the provincial level have provided numerous examples of each type of privatization in episodes that range from the sale of liquor stores in Quebec, to Ontario's abandoning the nursing home field to the private sector, to Alberta's contracting-out the making of social assistance payments.

"Not to be outdone, the current federal government has jumped on the bandwagon. In November 1984, it announced its intention to 'rationalize its portfolio of Crown corporations and other equity investments . . . based on the premise that a Crown corporation or other equity investment should be sold unless it is fulfilling a public policy purpose'. Subsequently it has sold De Havilland Aircraft to Boeing and it has sold the Northern Transportation Company, Canadian Arsenals Ltd. It has also indicated its desire to sell Teleglobe Canada, Canadair, Eldorado Nuclear, and the government's interest in the Canadian Development Corporations.

"Undenied rumors persist that it is interested in selling all or part of C.N., Petrocan and Air Canada. In addition, the government has made it clear that it plans to intensify the efforts begun by the previous government to contract-out public services.

"These initiatives that have already been taken by the current government have been given wild-eyed encouragement by the Nielsen study team reports which were published in March 1986. These reports also advise the government to abandon various fields of service delivery to the private sector. Canada's airports are prime target for this version of privatization. The reports also advise the government that charging user fees may help the stage for privatization by making the provision of certain public services profitable.

"As is the case with the other initiatives discussed in this statement, right-wing philosophical views establish the general frame of reference that supports privatization. In this case the philosophy is revealed in its starkest form: if an organization is private, it is more efficient, more competitive and therefore better. However, as is also the case with the other initiatives, the move toward privatization also reflects some more immediate issues.

"With regard to the privatization of Crown corporations, the public policy mandate of some of them has not been spelled out clearly. In addition, questions have been raised about the financial management and public accountability of some Crown corporations. In other cases the image of Crown corporations has been tarnished by the fact that key executive and directors' positions have been filled on a blatantly patronage basis. In this regard a low ebb was reached when a recent Tory appointee to the Board of Directors of Air Canada claimed that the only qualification for the job was having a driver's licence.

"In the case of contracting-out, the more immediate issues are nothing but examples of applied right-wing philosophy. It is alleged — usually without proof — that the private sector can provide services cheaper because the private sector has to meet the market test of efficiency (i.e. making a profit). It is also alleged that if certain skills and expertise are moved from the public to the private sector, then the goods and services to which they will give rise will be marketed more aggressively. With regard to the second point, it is worth noting the option that does not dawn on the champions of contracting-out: namely, to remove the limits now imposed on many public institutions to compete for business being done by the private sector.

"While valid concerns about Crown corporations exist, their wholesale privatization must be opposed. They are — by their nature — potentially important tools for implementing public policy both in the industries in which they operate, and in a wider sense as well.

"If we look at their role in the industries in which they operate, it is clear that:

- They can provide goods and services that cannot be provided on a profitable basis at an acceptable price (e.g. postal services);
- They can provide cheaper goods and services than the private sector (e.g. auto insurance and utilities);

- They can create competitive pressures in industries that would otherwise be dominated by private monopolies (e.g. rail services);
- They can insure that certain goods and services that are important from the point of view of economic strategy when no private capitalist is willing to produce them (e.g. aircraft manufacturing);
- They can provide public policy-makers with hands-on knowledge of key industrial sectors without which policy-making is difficult if not impossible (e.g. oil and gas); and
- They can contribute to the preservation and creation of our cultural heritage (e.g. C.B.C. and the National Film Board).

"In a wider sense it is equally clear that Crown corporations have the potential to serve as models to the private sector with regard to a wide range of public policy issues such as: pollution control, labour relations, affirmative action, developing Canadian technological capability, and cultivating Canadian suppliers of manufactured inputs.

"Thus the sale of Crown corporations amounts to throwing away tools to implement public policy. In context, it is ironic that the government would say that it will sell Crown corporations if they have no public policy purpose. For, if Crown corporations have no public policy purpose, the problem does not lie with the Crown corporations. The problem lies with the government that lacks the imagination and public policy commitment to define what those public policy purposes will be.

"The apparent passion of the current government to sell Crown corporations raises two additional problems. First, the passion to sell is likely to result in a bad financial deal for the Canadian public. The sale of De Havilland has already provided us with a rather grim picture of the plain-and-simple bad financial management to which the sale of Crown corporations can give rise; and this says nothing about the blow dealt to a uniquely Canadian aerospace industry that will result from the sale. In addition, the sale of Crown corporations to established companies is likely to result in corporate rationalizations that will mean job losses. Given the priority that must be attached to full employment in our current economic context, this is simply unacceptable.

"The issues raised by contracting-out are more diverse than in the case of selling Crown corporations. Yet there is one common issue that stands out prominently. Public sector employment can and should be used as a model with regard to a range of public policy objectives such as: affirmative action, labour relations, bilingualism, and regional development. To abandon various segments of public sector employment to the private sector through contracting-out means that the scope for directly implementing these policies will be reduced accordingly. Once again, we are looking at the abandonment of a potentially important tool of public policy. In this case the abandonment is particularly striking in view of the fact that the government refuses to impose measures such as affirmative action on the private sector.

"Of equal importance is the fact that the provision of lower cost services by the private sector may have little or nothing to do with the comparative efficiency of the private sector. It may simply reflect the fact that private sector 'competitors' can simply avoid a unionized labour force. The contracting-out of federal government cleaning services for office buildings provides a classic case in point.

"In the case of the federal government cleaners — and many others like it at all levels of government — the issue in contracting-out is not efficiency. The issue is how low can the government go in paying the people who provide the service. In context, contracting-out is part of a strategy to put downward pressure on all wages.

"This strategy on the part of governments is particularly perverse. In so many cases the alternatives are a unionized public sector workforce within which wage differentials have been reduced to a minimum, or a non-union workforce at the low end of the scale. The non-union low wage workforce is often so frightened about the very existence of their jobs that they will support the conditions that will allow their employers to bid successfully on public sector jobs.

"The contracting-out of public sector jobs gives rise to a number of other issues as well:

- There are no guarantees of lower cost services — especially when services are provided by monopoly suppliers;
- The quality of services may be sacrificed in the quest for profit;
- The accountability of governments for the quality of services may be lost; and
- The wholesale contracting-out of public services will result in a massive political pork-barrel unless the strictest of monitoring and control mechanisms are put in place.

"With regard to the last point, it is noteworthy that, as this statement is being prepared, a Tory M.P. is found to have written to his party's supporters soliciting names of companies tied to the Tory party that could take advantage of contracts issued by the Department of Supply and Services.

"Both privatization and contracting-out give rise to important questions that are specific to the particular case in point. In the case of a Crown corporation that may be privatized, it is important to know what public policy objectives can be achieved if public ownership is maintained and the alternative means of accomplishing those objectives if public ownership is given up. In the case of a service that may be contracted-out, questions about the quality of service, future costs, and public accountability for the quality of service, must be faced.

"Furthermore, there are substantial portions of the public sector in which privatization and contracting-out would be totally wrong in principle. For instance, in the provision of services that respond to human need such as health care, we should not even contemplate the possibility that the quality of service will be sacrificed to the quest for profit. In other areas, such as regulatory inspection services, it is critically important that public services be — and appear to be — impartial to conflicting private pressures and this impartiality cannot be maintained in the private sector. Again, privatization and contracting-out should be totally ruled out.

"However, these issues that are specific to individual cases in point have to be supplemented by a wider range of considerations relating to Canada's economic problems and the means of addressing them. For instance, in the context of Canada's current high rate of unemployment, privatization and contracting-out should not even be considered if they will result in job losses. Nor should they be considered if their effect will be to reduce the wage and salary levels of the people whose jobs are directly involved. Under current economic circumstances, it would be next to impossible to pursue either privatization or contracting-out without undermining the economic position of the workers directly involved and Canadian workers in general. To ignore or deny the interests of workers in considering these initiatives is public policy at its worst.

Fighting Back

"The Canadian Labour Congress has consistently opposed deregulation, privatization and a comprehensive free trade deal with the U.S. We have rejected them as being fundamentally wrong in-and-of-themselves, and we have rejected the philosophical vision that underlies them. An economy and society that are dominated by businesses pursuing their self-interest in the market place never has and never will operate to the advantage of working people.

"We can take pride in the fact that our opposition to a comprehensive free trade pact with the U.S. has forced the govern-

ment into a more open discussion of this issue that it had originally contemplated. And we can also take comfort in the growing opposition to the free trade initiative.

"Our efforts to date have not, however, removed these policies from the political agenda of conservative governments — federally, provincially, or municipally. In fact, the Nielsen study team reports have urged the federal government to pursue deregulation and privatization with a vengeance. These policies will keep arising in legislation and policy statements of governments, and at the bargaining table where workers will be forced to confront these policies and their effects.

"A successful strategy to combat these policies must be able to be sustained over a long period of time. It must identify the incredible damage that these policies will do to Canada. It must point out the links among these policies, and between them and the right-wing philosophy that guides them. It must lead to successful action both in the political arena and at the bargaining table.

"Clearly what is required is the mobilization of the length and breadth of the Canadian Labour movement and other groups in our society. To this end:

1. The Canadian Labour Congress, the provincial federations of labour, the local labour councils and the affiliated unions will use every means at their disposal to make sure that all Canadians understand that free trade, deregulation and privatization involve the abandonment of a Canadian tradition of using government to bring about a caring and sharing society in favour of a corporate vision that views the U.S. — with its extremes of wealth and poverty, with its minimal social services, with its decaying public institutions, with its over-bloated military, with its market-dominated philosophy — as the ideal that Canada should adopt; therefore:
2. The CLC will prepare print and audio visual material to explain to the trade union membership and the public at large, the dangers of these policies, their interrelationship and the philosophy that underlies them.
3. The CLC, the provincial federations of labour, local labour councils and the affiliated unions will undertake information and education campaigns that utilize: established publications and educational forums; special public meetings for the membership and the public at large; and the material referred to in Point 2.
4. To assist in the educational efforts of the various elements of the labour movement, the CLC will act as a central clearinghouse for resources on these issues.
5. The CLC will redouble its efforts to identify and make common cause with other organizations on these issues and without limiting the scope of joint activities it will: make the labour movement's educational and public relations material available to these groups; hold joint meetings and conferences on these issues; and engage in joint lobbying and other presentations of views to politicians.
6. Parallel efforts at coalition-building will be undertaken at the provincial and municipal level, and special efforts will be made to demonstrate the damage that these policies will do to provincial and local economies and societies.
7. The CLC will make every effort to engage friendly non-affiliated unions in the campaign against these policies.
8. The CLC Executive Council will establish target dates for a co-ordinated national information effort on these policies that will utilize the measures already proposed, plus: demonstrations in major Canadian centres; media advertising; card campaigns to politicians at all levels of government; and direct lobbying of politicians at all levels of government.
9. These information efforts will be repeated on a regular basis until free trade, deregulation and privatization are removed from the country's political agenda.
10. The CLC will co-ordinate the efforts of affiliated unions when they are confronted with these policies and their effects at the bargaining table, and it will organize support for them throughout the labour movement.

"What is at stake in the battle over free trade, deregulation and privatization is the right of Canadians to continue to use our democratic political institutions to shape our economic and social destiny. The advocates of these policies are telling us to abandon this tradition and cast our fate to the continental market and the will of the White House.

"These are issues on which we cannot afford to lose. A lean, mean market-dominated economy must be rejected. A caring, compassionate, planned economy that provides full employment, a high and rising standard of living and a more equal distribution of income and wealth must prevail. This is the point of the workers' agenda in the Economic Policy Statement."

MR. D. MARTIN (Executive Vice-President, CLC): On behalf of the Executive Council, I move adoption of this policy statement.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Concurrence in Document No. 19, "Our Canada or Theirs? Workers Confront the Corporate Blueprint" has been moved and seconded.

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW): I really appreciate the opportunity to lead off the discussion on the floor today on this very important paper of Free Trade, Deregulation and Privatization. Sometimes we ask ourselves what the central labour body does. We have just sat for about an hour and listened to a reasoned, well thought-out paper which makes an excellent case as to why we ought not to go down this road. This is the most important economic, political and social issue that has faced our country for many, many years. Now people say the only reason Bob White is in the debate is because he is worried about the auto pact. I am worried about the auto pact but I am in this debate, first of all, because I am worried about the future of this country called Canada. People would have us believe that this is about jobs in central Canada that does not affect the farmers in the West or the fishermen in the East. That is not true. This affects people every place from coast to coast. This is not just private sector jobs; this affects the public sector workers; and we should not allow the Mulroney government to divide the labour movement on this issue.

Now, what is it about? Well, first of all, it is about jobs. Simon Reisman's own study says at least 800,000 jobs will be restructured, never mind the loss of jobs. I challenge Prime Minister Mulroney or Simon Reisman or Donald Macdonald to tell us where this leap of faith is, where the new jobs are going to come from that are going to replace them. I have not heard the answer to that yet. This encourages a system that is based solely on who can be the most competitive in the world. It allows deregulation; it demands deregulation to make the corporations free to operate. It demands privatization of public corporations to allow them to operate. It puts enormous pressures on our current social programs and our ability to improve those social programs in the future. Equally important, it will determine what kind of a culture we are going to have in this country. Our cultural industries are faced by the giant take-overs by the American corporations. It is not an over-statement to say that this will severely limit our ability to make independent political decisions, both domestic and international. I was disgusted as a Canadian, as I watched our government's economic policy sit in limbo for two weeks, as 20 U.S. Senators determined whether or not they could work other solutions with President Reagan of the United States; that is a national disgrace.

This is about the kind of Canada that we want to have in the future, and do not let the Prime Minister and Joe Clark tell you that certain things are not going to be on the table. They are not bargaining with each other, they are bargaining with the Reagan administration. This is not a fight with the American workers either, because most of the American workers do not want any part of the free trade arrangement either. This is about the corporations and everything will be on the table. Now, I think we are

having an influence in this debate; the labour movement is making a difference. If you look at where the polls were when we started out, they have shifted significantly. I believe if we do our job in the labour movement, come Fall, the majority of Canadians will be in opposition to free trade. We do not want a deregulated "Rambo dog eat dog", everybody for themselves, survival-of-the-fittest society that Ronald Reagan wants in the United States. We have to say no to that in Canada; we have chosen, in this country, a different way of life. It may not be better but we have chosen that. We have chosen national health insurance and better unemployment insurance and several other social programs. Many of our former trade union leaders and former political leaders put their lives on the line and workers walked the picket lines to make those choices.

I think we have to send a clear message to Brian Mulroney about his "fast tracks"; that he better get on that fast track as we are on the fast track right behind him. The first message is that: our jobs are not up for sale, our social programs are not up for sale, our cultural identity is not up for sale, our political independence is not up for sale. Canada does not belong to the Government of Ottawa; it belongs to the people of this country; and we are going to have something to say about what happens to it in the future. We will hear a lot of well reasoned and good speeches today about the importance of this, but it will go for nothing if we do not go back into our municipalities, first of all to our members, to get them to understand the importance of this issue, and then to our communities because we are, in our unions along with the labour councils, getting municipalities to pass resoiutions against free trade. I believe that the people of Canada want none of this; the people of Canada want the corporations under proper control. We are not opposed to trade as long as we negotiate trading arrangements; but we are opposed to selling our country and I think we can do something about it.

MS. K. NAYLOR (CBRT & GW): I am opposed to free trade but, having said that, I would like to now speak in opposition to the policy paper. I am speaking against this document because it presents a dream Canada which does not exist. It is a dream that is only in the minds of those who want to tie the workers of Canada to the exploiters, to the aims of the exploiters. It is a document which negates all of the fighting traditions of the Canadian people, of Canadian workers who have always fought from day one against the domination of Canada by U.S. imperialism and who have, as their objectives and their aims, not the preservation of the status quo, which this document shamelessly presents, but the total elimination of this U.S. domination and an end to all exploitation and oppression.

This document stands in opposition to those fighting traditions and suggests, instead, that there is so-called Canadian tradition of using government to bring about a caring and sharing society; that this current offensive of the capitalists, which did not start with Mulroney, is abandoning that Canadian tradition; and that the government has some kind of a natural interest in bringing about this caring and sharing society. But workers have their feet on the ground. This is designed to attack the struggles of workers; and, instead, to line the workers up behind the aims of the capitalists. And you could see this when you have bigwigs in the trade union movement standing on the same platform as heads of corporations and saying "we all have a common interest here in opposing free trade". But the workers of Canada will never buy this. They know full well that Canada is not a caring and sharing society, that the governments are not just committed to bringing this about. This is a capitalist Canada; it is a society where the rich necessarily get richer and the poor necessarily get poorer. It is a society dominated economically, politically, culturally, militarily by the U.S. imperialists. And where all the governments, both provincial and federal, have contributed to selling out the land and labour of Canadian workers.

Whether the authors of this document like it or not, it is a Canada where the workers, due to the very real conditions of their life, are fighting life-and-death battles against this U.S. domination and against the shifting of the burden of the crisis on their backs. It is a Canada where the workers are fighting for their own objectives, not the objectives of the exploiters, for a society that is totally free of this foreign domination, totally free of exploitation; and they are waging this struggle not alone but in solidarity with workers all around the world. May Day of this year, 1986, is the 100th anniversary of May Day; and on May Day here in Toronto, there is going to be a picket at the U.S. Consulate against the U.S. dictates against Canada at 12:00 noon and I invite all the delegates to attend that.

MR. R. BARRY (President, UE): Congratulations are due to the CLC both for the leadership they have given and the work they have done in preparing the document we have before us and also the video that preceded the document. I think the CLC has taken and started to play an outstanding role in the fight against free trade. That fight has to continue, as Bob White has said earlier. I am in support of this paper and I think it is a very significant statement, as we enter the next phase of the free trade fight, because, in spite of the rally that we had the other day that we consider to be a success, we still have a long way to go. The strength of this paper is not simply the identification of the disaster that a free trade will bring for Canadians, we have already gone through a lot of that; but I think the strength of the paper is also the linking of the issues of deregulation and privatization with the free trade, as part of the right wing corporate agenda and their attack on the working people of Canada in order to shape our economy in the interest of the corporate sector.

There is no need to repeat the well-formulated arguments of the paper, except to say that if we lose the fight on free trade, we will also lose our economic, our cultural and our political independence. In our union's industry, the electrical industry, free trade will mean lost jobs. It will mean less production in Canada and more pressure for concessions by the transnationals that dominate that industry. While a large part of our energy as a labour movement must be spent in fighting free trade, we must always remember that free trade is not the corporate goal. It is one of the means by which the transnationals are pursuing their real goal, that of making the working people of the world subservient to the corporate quest for profits. Deregulation, privatization, cutbacks in social services and assistance, and attacks on trade union rights are also part of the corporate agenda for taking that control.

A preview of what free trade deregulation of privatized Canada would look like was seen last week as our government came to a halt, waiting for 20 U.S. Senators to decide what they want for us as Canadians. And those Senators' votes reflected the dominant corporations and what their regions wanted. Just to get to the bargaining table, the Mulroney government has scrapped the Foreign Investment Review Agency; it has ended the National Energy Program; it has given De Havilland away to the U.S. giant Boeing; it has allowed Gulf and Western to take over Prentice Hall of Canada; and the list could go on and on and on.

Why did the Americans even have to come to the negotiating table when Mulroney is already giving everything away just to get things going. And what do you suppose Mulroney promised Reagan in order to swing the lumber Senators' vote on the Senate Finance Committee? This paper makes crystal clear that the Canadian labour movement will not let our country be given away to the United States or to the transnational corporations through free trade, deregulation, privatization or by any other means. This paper has a ten-point action policy. I would hope that the paper passes this Convention unanimously. Everyone of us, in voting for this paper, must also be making a commitment on the part of our organizations to get these words into action. Our country's future will depend upon our putting the words into action over the coming years. We, as a labour movement, are

united on this issue as we are on few others. Now, let us put our unity to the test, let us put our unity to work.

MS. M. MORTON (CUPE): I am opposed to free trade but I am at a con mike because I am opposed to this policy paper. A previous speaker suggested that the authors of this paper were living in a fantasyland. Let us speak, as this paper says it is going to do, about our Canada and theirs. Canada is not a land in which the government is used to bring about a caring and sharing society as this paper says. Canada is a nation which is divided between the exploiters and the exploited. It is divided between those who have already sold this country for profit, for dollars; divided between the exploiters, between the bourgeoisie who have never had one shred of patriotic sentiments, who have never defended the independence and sovereignty of Canada, who have sold Canada so that Canada today is a country which is dominated economically, militarily, politically, and culturally by the U.S.

Standing in opposition to this are the struggles of the Canadian working class and people. This paper suggests that if free trade comes about, then all these consequences will take place. But the fact of the matter is that the Canadian working class and people who have fought for a very long time against the U.S. imperialism, against the economic dictates, against the war preparations of the U.S. imperialists, against tying our country hand and foot to the war machine of U.S. imperialism, against the cultural aggression insult of U.S. imperialism in our country. And this struggle has been led and fought by the working class. Nothing is changed. Because Mulroney is advocating free trade, are we now to say that the aims of the working class, the objectives of the working class have to be forgotten and again we should tie ourselves to some section of the capitalists who for their own reasons oppose free trade? The capitalists in this country look at the question of free trade simply from the point of view of their profits, or making maximum profits.

So some are for, some are against. The working class looks at this question from the question of principle, from the question of the future of our country, of the whole struggle for independence and sovereignty, for fundamental questions facing the workers, those who produce the wealth, those who create all the material blessings in society. The wealth should belong to the toilers, not to the foreign imperialists, not to the money-bags of Canada. This is the question facing the working class and it has not changed because Mulroney has brought about free trade. It is very important to suggest that all we need to do now is go back a few years, to an idyllic time which existed in the past, a time when supposedly the governments were all about caring and sharing. What the hell governments are they talking about? The government which imposed six and five? The government which imposed wage controls? The government which has stripped the legal right to strike from the workers? Is this the government they are talking about?

We workers should not have any illusions on these questions. The future of our country is a question of the working class and there is only one way that the working class will be able to shape the political and economic destiny in our country: that future is through the political power of the working class. So we should oppose anyone who tells us to become the tail of this or that section of the rich; we should oppose anyone who says that we have common interests, if only we can fight on this one issue. We have to keep in mind that the issue is for the workers, what we have to fight for in order to have a future in which we have independence, sovereignty, peace, socialism, in order that the real aims and objectives of our class be realized.

MR. J.C. PARROT (National President, CUPW): First, I would like to congratulate the CLC officers for presenting a document that covers the three issues of free trade, deregulation and privatization. I commend them for having understood the importance of linking these issues together, for, as the document points out, all three have a common objective. As we can see in the fourth paragraph, the objective is to transfer power and authority from the public political sphere to the private corporate sphere. For us, it is not only a matter of which jobs we are going to lose but also a question of what kind of society we want. Will it be the one the government is proposing, a society in the hands of private enterprise, or the kind we want, a society for workers, for the people of our country?

The document we have before us contains a very good analysis of the three issues and even more. It proposes a ten-point program of action, which should keep us quite busy over the next two years. And that is fine because these issues are, of course, most important.

In 1982, the Canadian Labour Congress made a firm commitment to fight against concessions and, in my opinion, this proved not only to be an important strategy but also a successful one. In spite of the difficulties we encountered, the fight against concessions was a great success due in part to the commitment taken at the Convention. We should take the same approach with regard to the issues being discussed today. Every one of us here should make a similar commitment and return home and show our members and every one with whom we shall be working the importance of linking these three issues together. This is the kind of thing that can be achieved within the labour movement; we have done it in the past; we have to be in a position to determine the kind of society we want.

There is a message we have to give today to Brian Mulroney: It is that we are willing to fight back against these issues of free trade, deregulation and privatization. We are willing to fight back in the same way we fought back when we took a commitment at this Convention in 1982, when we decided to fight back concessions. I think we have been quite successful in that area and I feel we could do the same thing; every one here could give that commitment today that when we are going to go back, we are going to be all fighting together. And that means also that when we will organize a demonstration — which is one of the points in the ten-point program — that we will all be there, private sector and public sector, small unions and large unions; that is the way we are going to show to the government that we are united on that issue along with all the other points that are in this document.

MS. B. SEED (CUPE): I rise in opposition to this document. According to this document, there is a danger on the horizon of domination and plunder of Canada by the United States, or hardship and suffering for Canadian workers as a result of free trade. I am opposed to anything which increases the American domination of Canada including free trade, but I am also opposed to the misapprehensions of this document.

According to this document, there is a Canadian tradition, a tradition of a sharing and caring society. According to this document, in contradiction to that tradition is something which is called an economy and society that are dominated by businesses pursuing their self-interest in the market place. Well, I do not know in what Canada the authors of this document live in, but in the Canada that I and my fellow workers live in, this is precisely the situation that we face; this is precisely the source, along with the American domination of Canada, of the crisis and all the problems that face the Canadian workers. The fact is that long before Brian Mulroney came on the scene and long before this so-called free trade was proposed, Canada has been dominated politically, economically, culturally and militarily by the U.S. to the detriment of the Canadian people and the people of the world. It is the Canadian bourgeoisie and its governments, both federally and provincially, Liberal, Conservative and NDP, which have a tradition in this country of selling out to the foreign imperialists. Is that the tradition that this document wants the workers to uphold?

Competition between the exploiters for market is not an affair on which the workers should take sides. The aims and objectives of the working class, our aims, are to put an end to exploi-

tation, not to line up behind one or another section of the rich to pursue and assist them in the pursuit of their own objectives against one another. I take great exception to the distortion of the history and traditions of the Canadian workers and of the society that we live in. This caring and sharing society that the document refers to is the society which tramples on the rights of the workers, which engages in cutbacks, which demands concessions, all of the things that we claim to be fighting against. These are what exist in this Canada and what the workers have been fighting against.

Let us look at the United States, let us look at their domination of Canada. No one who stands for peace or national independence and freedom can fail to condemn the United States for their crimes against the peoples of the world, including the savage bombing of Libya which took place not very long ago, which the Canadian government wholeheartedly supported. This is a crime against the people of the entire world including the Canadian people. The workers' movement must demand that Canada get out of NATO, that Canada refuse to support these aggressive policies of the United States. There are two traditions in Canada; not one. One is the tradition of the exploiters to suck the blood of the Canadian people to sell out our sovereignty and our interests to foreign imperialists. The other is a tradition of the working class which is a tradition, since day one, of fighting against exploitation, for an end to exploitation, for an end to foreign domination. This is the tradition on which the workers stand on May Day. This Thursday is May 1st, International Working Class Day, I urge all the delegates to this Convention to go to the U.S. Consulate to state our determination, as a Canadian working class, to end exploitation and to end the U.S. dictates over our country.

MR. A. KUBE (President, B.C. Federation of Labour): Some time ago, I really wanted to know why we had any form of bilateral free trade negotiations with the United States because after all, 80 per cent of our exports to the United States are free. We heard, for instance, from Marcel Masse that the cultural industries were not on the bargaining table; we heard from Mr. Clark that food marketing boards were not on the table; and our friends in Ontario were telling us that the auto pact was not on the table. Indeed I asked myself at that time: what was there to negotiate in the first place? But now the story starts to come clear. We are now convinced that everything is on the bargaining table, including all those things from British Columbia and the United States. Why do you think Peckwood decided to vote, give that ten votes to the president? It is because some assurance was given that lumber exports from British Columbia to the United States would be curtailed in some form, affecting jobs in British Columbia.

We have too much free trade with the United States already. They have all our eggs in one nest. If we want to liberalize trade, we should talk much more in terms of bilateral trade either through GATT or through UNCTAD to make sure that every time the United States does not have a cold, we do not die from some unmentionable disease. In British Columbia, we are concerned about trade; we are concerned about trade because we know that B.C. farmers in the lower mainland can, in no way, compete with the farmers in the State of Washington and our farming industry would be destroyed. We also know, on the question of services, what the future jobs are; we cannot effectively compete with the United States. We have some complaints in British Columbia with the rest of the country, especially with Ontario. For instance, we should have much fairer trade between Ontario and British Columbia because for every one dollar we buy from you, you sell us five; so we want some liberalization in that particular trade. But let me tell you we are prepared to support the rest of Canada in opposition to free trade.

There should be some balance in trade. You cannot sell more to one country consistently than you buy from that particular country. But we should understand that we have accumulated a massive deficit over the years between Canada and the United States and if we want to reinstitute ourselves as a sovereign nation, politically and economically, somehow we are going to have to have surpluses over a number of years so we can pay back the money we have borrowed, for instance, for our massive Hydro developments. A number of years ago we negotiated the Columbia River Treaty between Canada and the United States. It was supposed to be so greatly beneficial to our country, while in British Columbia we owed $8 billion resulting from the Columbia River Treaty.

Fair trade by all means, diversification of trade with all nations to the world by all means, but not a situation where we do not really talk about the question of trade but the question of levelling, reducing our welfare benefits in this country to the level which are being unfortunately put on American workers. That is the question really we have to discuss. There was no economic justification to have a country a hundred years ago where our forefathers said: "Yes, we are prepared to pay a price to remain in a country called Canada." We have to be prepared to pay the price and the price of free trade is too high.

MR. D. McNABB (NUPGE-OPSEU): I rise to speak in opposition to the policy paper simply because of the fact that whoever wrote this paper must have done it at least six months ago maybe even eight, because in reality the issues that are covered in the policy statement are issues of past facts.

We are now in a state where the boats with Mulroney and Ronald Reagan have left the shore and we are not on it; they are going to go on a fishing trip; and, whatever they catch out there, we are going to be left behind. We should make sure that we have a voice, that we are going to be participants in this free trade program, because it is too late now for us to go wandering into our constituencies and telling our people, here is what is going to happen if free trade goes on. The Americans made the decision last week, even at a tie vote, and the only reason that Mulroney will back up is because there is going to be a third world war. Other than that, the ship is gone, they are out sailing. I say to all the delegates here, I know I am not going to defeat this policy paper, but I am asking that the Congress officers say: okay, maybe the gentleman is right, maybe it is time that we go in there and say, look, you guys are going to screw up this country. We want to get in there and prevent it because there is no sense of issuing all of this paper and sending our people out now to talk about the horse. The horse is gone, you have got to lock the barn with something else.

MR. F. POMEROY (President, CWC): One of the good things about this particular paper is that we have the capacity with the people we have in this room to go back to our communities, do the job that has to be done, and win and make this an on-going victory. Deregulation and privatization or free trade is nothing short of a cancer: it threatens the way of life that we live, destroys our jobs and cuts services to our consumers, and as Bob White said, it threatens the very kind of society that we are going to have in this country.

I would like to be able to spend my time talking about the free trade aspects of this issue but many others have spoken in favour of that. I want to say I support them; but because our union has been involved in a particular fight about deregulation in the telephone industry, I want to concentrate my remarks on that aspect of the paper today. I think we have had some experiences that lend support to the dynamics that are set out in this paper; and some experiences that will be useful to the delegates when they get home in dealing with the whole issue of deregulation, privatization and free trade.

We have had, since the last Congress Convention, a major campaign under way using radio, television and newspapers to get our message across over telephone deregulation. We are not the biggest organization in the country; but we spent over half a million dollars on these activities and I can tell you that it was money well spent. It set things up so that when we went to lobby

politicians at all levels, federal provincial and municipal, in all parties, it gave us a better opportunity to get our message across. We have set up an organization known as CATS, the Coalition for Affordable Telephone Service, which included native peoples, old age pensioners, the CLC and many other social organizations. Though the battle is not over, we have been winning the fights as they have been coming along, one by one. And we are not fools, we do not believe that we have put deregulation on hold forever; but we have been making progress. We have been making that progress because we have been getting a tremendous amount of support from the affiliates that are represented in this room, from the federations of labour and from the labour councils and so on, back home.

One of the lessons that we learned in our campaign to date has been that we really need to get out and broaden our support in the rest of the community. Document 19 calls for that kind of action. The employers have a pretty seductive line; they make it sound like everybody is going to save money somehow from deregulation and somehow everyone is going to gain a job from deregulation and privatization and free trade. But the cruel truth is that it is all a major scam. It is a scam to transfer the costs onto the backs of workers, to threaten our jobs, to reduce our standard of living, to make sure that the jobs that do exist are at minimum wage and so on; and to reduce services to consumers. And we are going to have to fight like hell to make sure that this does not become a reality in this country.

Now in the telephone industry they started out with an approach to deregulate the whole business of long distance service and that this is an industry that is on the leading edge of the technological revolution. Yet, since 1979 there are over 2,000 fewer telephone operators working in Ontario and Quebec alone; there are over 1,500 fewer technicians working. In Northern Telecom, the company that is supposed to be on the leading edge of designing the technology, there are many hundreds of jobs that have been moved outside of the country. When the telephone company wanted to deregulate long distance service, in our campaign we were able to show that costs were going to go up something like 200 per cent to 400 per cent for local service; and that something like 400,000 people in Ontario and Quebec were going to lose basic telephone service. So even the CRTC had to take action to put it on hold.

I want to urge the adoption of this report and to urge delegates to not only go home and say we did a good thing at this Convention, but we have got to go home and push to expand this and build the kind of coalitions that are necessary. We can win this one.

MR. L. GERARD (Steelworkers): When I read the title, "Free Trade, Privatization and Deregulation", it sort of has a nice corporate ring to it. It sort of tells a story just in the title. I want to give a message from the United Steelworkers. The issue of privatization is an issue that affects us all. It is an issue that we should think about in at least two senses: no, just the sense of this government not providing service, but the selling of Crown corporations.

The selling of Crown corporations is nothing more than an ability of corporations to rationalize their productivity and eventually eliminate jobs, because they believe that if they give this to the private sector, they will do a better job. Coming from the United Steelworkers and seeing what INCO has done in the mining industry, the private sector does not do a better job; seeing what Algoma has done in the steel industry the private sector does not do a better job. That is a myth.

I want to talk about the issue of contracting-out in the public sector. That issue is not important just to the public sector. We never once went to the bargaining table and negotiated a collective agreement with rates of pay, health and safety standards, rights for workers, wage increases with a view of coming back and having those jobs sold to the lowest bidder, whether it is in the private sector or the public sector. What this government is doing, when it is talking about privatization and contracting the work out, what it is really talking about is putting people's jobs up for sale to the lowest bidder; and when they are putting up to the lowest bidder, they are talking about generally the non-union bidder, the person who is opposed to union rights, the person who is opposed to union shops. Do we want the kind of society that puts the hospitals in the private sector's hands, that we then have health care for profit? Do we want the kind of society where we can mail a letter across the province with the courier service, but it costs $4, $5 or $6? With all the problems of the post office if they were charging that kind of money to mail letters, there would be no problem. So really what we are talking about is the elimination of jobs.

My union is an international union. My national director, Gérard Docquier, my international president, Lynn Williams, spoke out early and hard against free trade, against deregulation and against privatization, because we see it in our union for what it is. It is an attack by the corporate right to undermine living standards of working people whether it is in Canada that we love, in the U.S. or in Britain and I want to raise the issue of Britain. One of the speakers a while ago said the train had left, the boat was leaving, the horse was gone and we should get on the bandwagon. I do not agree. We have watched in Britain the same agenda under the right-wing regime of Margaret Thatcher and all we have to do is look overseas and see what is happening in Britain. A society that they built is being destroyed; kids are revolting against industries because they do not have jobs; there is no housing for the poor; there is no health care. We do not have to relive the British experience in Canada, we can see it. All we have to do is look and see what is happening in the U.S. The poor have increased, so have the uneducated; health care has declined. That is the right-wing corporate agenda.

We have the ability, with the leadership that we have in this hall, to take the fight to the workplace, to the mine face, to the office and to the streets. We have people that drive subway cars and transit cars and people in those cars talk to people every day. This issue has to be taken to the public and has to be taken for what it is.

Far too often we come here and we agree with the document and then it stays in our briefcases. Go home and read those documents, go home and get those tools. I say the train has not left, we should be in the engine; and we should be in the engine that is going to stop the deregulation, the privatization and the sale of our jobs to the lowest bidder with free trade.

MR. J. HUNTER (President, CBRT & GW): Document 19 talks about a corporate blueprint and that is exactly what it is. The question of free trade is beginning to be understood by the people of this country as a result of the Congress. The question of deregulation is not understood by the people of this country, particularly in the transportation industry and, in fact, will be just as desperate on the whole question of Canadian sovereignty, if deregulation of the transportation industry proceeds as under the freedom of movement.

The transportation industry in this country was built by the founders of our country to ensure that we had a country. If it had not been left to the free enterprise system, they were not going to build a railway and that is what made this country possible. Following that, the railway system was put into effect and then the highway system, and then the airways and waterways. That is what they want to take away now as a result of deregulation of the transportation industry. If there is any doubt about that, all you have to do is look in the Mazankowski paper on "Freedom to Move". He says the purposes are increased competition, less government interference and freer markets. What is that going to bring for free enterprise? What it is going to do is open up our borders to the United States' trucking companies to come into Canada; it is going to open up the borders for the United States

railway companies to come into Canada. We only have to look at the airline industry to understand what is happening because they are already in Canada. In fact, you have to understand, to compete with a country like the United States, the transportation industry is due to fail unless there are some regulations to prevent that.

There are by-products as well. Why would the people who run this country sell out our country to the United States? Well, it is pure and simple: for profits. That is what it is all about and, furthermore, the by-products to that are a charge on the working people of this country. All you have to do is look south of the border for deregulation of the airline industry in Canada or the trucking industry. It has resulted in concessionary bargaining by the employers; it has resulted in the forcing of two-tiered wage systems which divide the workers; it has resulted in layoffs and the pool of unemployed that is in the country. Mr. Mazankowski says, "Do not worry about safety, safety will never be affected by deregulation". Anybody who thinks that the free enterprise system, based on the bottom line of profits, is going to be safety-conscious unless there are regulations, is dreaming in technicolor. All you have to do is look at the Canadian Pacific Railway, that fine institution of ours. They have already indicated that, in order to survive in deregulation, they have to be self-governing for safety. We have had ten railway accidents in this country since January 1st, with highly toxic materials. And this is the company that says they have got to lessen regulation, so that they can operate in effect in a more profitable fashion. The Canadian National Railways, the other day, said that, in order to compete in the deregulated society with the United States railways, they were going to have to lay off 10,000 more workers, other than the 17,000 they had already laid off. If you do not think that is going to be a safety problem, well then I say again that we are being led down the garden path. And this is from a government that says: "Let us have some consultations." Well, they went across the country in ten weeks and consulted and did not even in fact go beyond the borders of three provinces. We have to fight back and the union that I represent has been doing that. We have presented a pamphlet in which we are going to ask you to sign at this Convention which will call on Mazankowski to stop deregulation and we would ask hopefully that you will do that.

There is nothing free in this world for working people. Whether it is free trade, or freedom to move, or free enterprise, which is the epitome of privatization, what the ruling classes in this country have done, by Mr. Mazankowski and the Prime Minister is in fact to launch a free-for-all on the working people in this country.

MR. C. PILKEY (President, OFL): I wanted to take just five seconds to respond to the brother who said that the ship has left the harbour. Let me remind him what we are doing here today. Before that ship reaches its destination, we are going to sink it! And secondly, the reason we are not on it is because we would be a casualty; we do not want any casualties in the labour movement when we are fighting free trade. I think what we ought to be doing is creating an atmosphere of public debate right across this nation. The reason we have got to have a public debate on free trade is because the Mulroney government does not want a debate on free trade. He wants to negotiate an agreement with the Americans and bring it back here. Well, we ought to have a public debate, we ought to be raising the awareness of the Canadian people, their consciousness about free trade and what it will do to this nation. Mulroney has no mandate to negotiate a bilateral trade agreement with the United States. If you go back and look at the leadership convention in 1983, Mr. Mulroney said at that time that he was opposed to free trade; that it was like sleeping with an elephant and if the elephant rolled over, you were dead. He also said during that leadership campaign that if there was an economic downturn, then all you had to look at was Georgia, North Carolina, Ohio: all the jobs would move there and they would shut them down here in Canada. So I am saying that Mr. Mulroney has no mandate because he led the Canadian people to believe he was in opposition to free trade. Let me also say that had free trade been an election issue in 1984, Mr. Mulroney would not have got the 211 seats in Parliament.

Mr. Reisman has said that everything is on the table, that somehow we have got to get on that "level playing field" that the Americans talk about. What does that mean? That means that everything is on the table. Mr. Reisman has said in effect everything is on the table and one of the things that is going to be on the table that nobody really thinks about, is the exchange rate. If you think the Americans are going to let us trade with them with a 70-cent dollar, somebody is living in a fairyland. They are going to even up those exchange rates. Look at the free trade agreement they just negotiated with Israel; they put the shekel on an even basis with the American dollar. That is what is going to happen here in Canada and those industrialists are not going to get the break that they are looking for through the exchange rates. Also, Mr. Mulroney has said that we have got to make concessions. We fought those concessions with all of the courage and the will that we had; and now Mulroney is going to make them in the United States for us. He also says that we are timid, insecure, the apostles of the status quo. I would like to know when the labour movement has ever been the apostle of the staus quo! We have been fighting for change all of our lives and we will continue to fight for those changes.

Let me just finally say this. There is going to be a severe recession, a lot of jobs are going to be lost in this country; 281,000 have been lost here in Ontario and we do not need more unemployment, we have enough now. I think Mr. Mulroney would have been better advised to take the energy he and his government are using to negotiate a free trade agreement and translate that into a job-creation program; and let us put this country back into a status of full employment, where everyone has a job and can enjoy a decent standard of living.

MR. V. BOURGEOIS (IAM): In the IAM, free trade is now a Canadian issue, it is a workers' issue. Our international union, on both sides of the border, is totally opposed to the Mulroney/Reagan plan, because that duo is out to make corporate Canada and America richer at our expense. Free trade amounts to the sleaziest kind of job blackmail. Under free trade, we would be negotiating wages and benefits at the lowest common denominator. Factories might as well have wheels put under them because American and Canadian workers would be barging into concessions and giveaways under the treat of runaway plants. Our jobs, our culture, our social and political sovereignty are all at stake. The Machinists say Canada is not for sale.

We, in the IAM, know only too well what free trade, deregulation, privatization can do. It is important to remember that free trading amounts to one and the same: corporate, conservative warfare against the workers. Consider this: de facto deregulation in the air transport industry has already cost hundreds of jobs in Canada. Eastern Provincial Airway is no more, and one must not think because it was bought by CP Air that our people all transferred over. No way, we lost over 200 jobs in that move. Nordair is being gobbled up, Quebecair is physically bankrupt. Deregulation has led to several strikes, the latest being the four-month conflict at Pacific Western Airlines. We are in danger, a real danger of losing one of the last domestically controlled industry in this country. Deregulation has started it, free trade will guarantee it. Consider also Mulroney's frantic rush to sell off our publicly owned and largely profitable assets. In aerospace he has sold out to corporate America. Boeing, De Havilland. In the IAM we are determined that the same fate will not befall our other publicly owned aircraft manufacturer, Canadair.

On the railway, privatization is coming in through the back door. CNR is trying to sell its Moncton main shops to the General Electric Corporation. G.E. will get the shops while our 1,200 workers will get the boot. At stake are more than 1,200 shop jobs. The very survival of the city of Moncton is subject to the

ideological stupidity of the Tory privatization plan. The whole community is with us in Moncton.

A unanimous vote in support of this paper is essential; anything less would be a blow to the thousands of machinists and other workers who are already suffering the consequences of this free trade deregulation, privatization disease.

MS. L. NICHOLSON (CUPE): I have been one of those officers of the Ontario Federation of Labour who have gone across this province listening to people, finding out the ramifications of free trade. I have listened to farmers and I have heard their problems: "We will have no farming industry, it is much cheaper to farm in California, the weather is better." I have listened to small businessmen and I have listened to the breweries; they will no longer be in business. That translates into jobs. I have listened to the citizens and I have listened to coalitions from church groups. Everyone, everyone wherever you go, is not for free trade.

In the beginning, they thought free trade was the fact they could go across the river, they could buy something, bring it back to this country and not pay any duty. When we started to talk about free trade, they found out exactly what it meant. We found out it means plant closures, loss of jobs, splintering of family ties because workers would have to move from one place to another, travel wherever there were jobs. And Mr. Mulroney says there will be jobs. Well I think it is time we said to him, it is show and tell time my friend! If there is going to be jobs, tell us where those jobs are, tell us what kind of jobs they are.

Textiles, needle trades, female-dominated trades will be wiped out. We will no longer have those jobs, nor breweries, shoe industries. Let me tell you about a managing director of Florsheim in London who appeared before us. We went to him and we said: "what are the ramifications for the shoe industry?" And he said to us: "As a Canadian, I know it is bad for Canada, free trade is bad for Canada, but our decisions will be made in the corporate boardroom in Chicago and the shoe industry in London will no longer be there. We will be an outlet, a consumer outlet". Tax losses, the billions of dollars of tax losses to the federal government will translate into public sector jobs. So we are not just talking about industrial jobs, we are talking about public sector jobs too. We are talking about the sharing, caring society that you have heard of today because that is the area that my union works in: we are social service workers, we are hospital workers, we are the CBC, we share and we care.

I heard after the free trade rally that we are wrapping ourselves in the Canadian flag. Well, my friends, it is my choice to wrap myself in the Canadian flag, because I am Canadian and I choose to be Canadian. I choose not to be an American. We are moving very, very slowly towards equality in this country for our women workers with our male workers. If we go into free trade with the Americans, we will have less equality, we will have less security, and we will have a hell of a lot less caring. On free trade, everything is on the table; that means everything that we have fought for in this country over the years: the laws that we live under, safety and health, the right to organize, the right to bargain, not the best in the world but much better than what the American workers have. They would like some of the laws that we have. The right-to-work laws from the southern states also are on the table so we will have the right to work for less. We are a uniquely Canadian society and culture. We have a society that no calculus in the world can measure the true value of. That is where we are, that is where we are going to stay, and this country and its citizens are not for sale.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Well, the question is being called. All those in favour of the question being put, please show your hands. Hands down. Any opposed? The motion is carried for the question to be put. All those in favour of the concurrence of the Document No. 19 "Our Canada or Theirs? Workers Confront the Corporate Blueprint", please raise your hands? Down. Any opposed? From where I see it, it is unanimous. Thank you.

MR. R. PROCTOR (NUPGE): Point of information, Madam Chairperson. We just had a very stimulating debate on an important topic. Unfortunately, in my opinion, it was marred by the fact that a lengthy document was read aloud and probably consumed about fifty minutes of our time. I do not intend to direct any disrespect to either the readers or the content of the document that we heard, but surely in this day and age we could get a précis or an executive summary. There are a number of other extensive lengthy policy statements that are due this week, can we anticipate a précis or an executive summary of these?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you for the question. Bob White, would you like to make a comment?

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW): Let me just respond on behalf of the Executive Council. We did think about that and we thought also that this is really an educational forum here as well, and if you just do highlights, it takes away from some of the content. For this paper, because it was the main policy paper coming before the Convention and took in three very important issues, we felt it would be very difficult to do an executive summary. There are a lot of new delegates here and this really becomes their first educational process in some aspects and that is the reason we took the time to do it.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I am now going to call on the Committee on Legislation.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

MR. C. PILKEY (Legislative Committee Chairperson): We are starting with Resolution L-12. The Committee recommends concurrence in the following substitute resolution to cover Resolutions L-7, L-21, L-25, L-38 and L-41.

"WHEREAS many workers continue to earn salaries which are at, or only slightly above the minimum wage; and

"WHEREAS the grossly inadequate federal minimum wage of $4 per hour is responsible for very many workers, especially women, immigrants, and young workers, living below the poverty level; and

"WHEREAS the labour movement must play a leadership role in the struggle to eliminate poverty and redistribute the wealth produced by the collective labour of working Canadians;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress mount a broad public campaign to compel the federal government to implement a substantial increase in the federal minimum wage as a step in the critical struggle to eliminate wage discrimination against women, immigrants and youth; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC bring pressure to bear on the federal government to use its influence with the provinces to similarly increase the minimum wage and remove the discrepancies among the various provinces".

On behalf of the Committee, I move adoption.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence.

MR. O. NUNEZ (UE): I am, naturally, in favour of an increase of the federal minimum wage, as well as in every province and territory of Canada, but I am against the resolution that is being presented by the Legislative Committee today. At its last convention, the Québec Federation of Labour adopted a resolution asking that the minimum wage be increased to $6 an hour. At its last convention in Toronto, last April, my union also asked the federal government to increase the minimum wage to $6, and, amongst the many resolutions that were sent to this Convention, there are at least two asking for an increase to $6. Therefore, I suggest that this resolution be referred back and that the Committee return with a $6 hourly minimum wage. This is crucial for the youth, women and immigrant workers of this country. Increasing the minimum wage is one sure way of fighting off poverty. I

propose that someone move referral so that the resolution returns with an hourly rate of $6.

MS. I. HARRIS (ACTWU): It is very important that one of the target groups mentioned in the resolution are women. There are a lot of problems. A lot of women that are in unorganized jobs are working for the minimum wage which is just too low. Making in some provinces $4.00 an hour, we have problems at the federal level and this resolution says just do something provincially. Here in Ontario where it is $4.00 an hour, it is a disgrace. Yes, some women who are making $4.00 an hour, working 40 hours a week, are only taking home $160 gross. By the time that net pay comes home there is not a lot to feed kids, pay the rent and just to survive. The Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto found that here in Toronto you need to make at least $21,000 a year if you are a single mother with a child. If you are making $4.00 an hour minimum wage, you just cannot survive. We need to start campaigns to get the minimum wage raised.

In another context, a lot of us are fighting for equal pay for work of equal value. We put forth the arguments that if we could increase the minimum wage, it is another way of raising wages for women; it is another way to tackle the equal pay for equal value fight. I urge all delegates to get involved in this issue. It is important that we raise it federally; it is important that the minimum wage be raised in all of the provinces. It is critical for all of the target groups that are mentioned and, particularly, in the fight of women around equal pay.

MR. A.E. JENKYN (UE): In keeping with the remarks made by the speaker previously, I would like to make a motion of referral of this resolution back to Committee with the specific instructions to bring in a minimum wage figure of $6.00 in this resolution.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): There as been a motion to refer, it is seconded. There is no debate. All those in favour of the motion to refer put your hands up. Down. Opposed. The motion to refer is carried.

MS. J. LANGAN (Legislative Committee Secretary): The next resolution is one on part-time employees, Resolution L-18, amended:

> "WHEREAS more and more employers are utilizing a part-time work force; and
>
> "WHEREAS employers are using these part-time workers as a cheap source of labour, and provide these part-time workers with inferior wages, benefits and working conditions; and
>
> "WHEREAS many of these part-time workers were seeking full-time employment and had to settle for part-time work;
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress pressure the federal government to enact legislation to give part-time workers equal pay, equal benefits, seniority, and paid vacations on a pro-rata basis".

The Committee moves concurrence.

MR. P. MIDDLETON (SEIU): I rise unfortunately against this resolution. That is a serious issue and I think many of us in the public sector and the private sector recognize the growth of part-time employees in the work force and the corresponding exploitation of those workers. I am very concerned with some of the problems we have experienced as a union negotiating in the public sector for part-time employees. In hospitals, nursing homes, homes for the aged and so forth, probably half of our membership in some of these institutions are now part-time employees; and we have struggled with a consistent campaign since the early seventies to gain for these employees rights and benefits equal to those for their full-time counterparts in their collective agreements. I find that the changes that the Committee has made to this resolution go in the opposite direction to the types of techniques of gaining equal benefits in the collective agreement that we have negotiated. Let me just explain with a couple of examples.

When the Committee replaces the words that they have, "calendar years and not on hours worked", with "pro-rata basis", let me explain what the implication is. We have negotiated for part-time employees what we think are equal bucks to those that full-time employees enjoy in their benefits. Here is one example. An employer is supposed to pay 100 per cent OHIP premiums on behalf of full-time employees. What the employer is more than happy to do is negotiate for part-time employees that they will do it on a pro-rata basis. Let me explain why the employer is happy about that. The employer is happy because a part-time employee in Ontario is defined as an employee that works 24 hours or less per week on the average. That means right away you knock that premium payment support by the employer down to 50 per cent pro-rata. Then, as the part-time employee works less and less and less per week or per month or per quarter, the employer's share becomes less and less and less on a pro-rata basis. What it means is that a part-time employee who wants OHIP coverage in Ontario, hospitalization coverage, has to pay the corresponding amount that the employer does not pay, 50 per cent, 60 per cent, 75 per cent. What it means is a part-time employee ironically is forced into the position where they have to spend more and more of their wage dollar to pay for the benefit equivalent. Secondly, the resolution has been changed around to go in the opposite direction that we have developed on that issue. What we have negotiated fairly successfully is a percentage equivalent benefits allowance for part-time employees. We have got it as high as 14 per cent of wages paid for part-time employees that put the dollars in their pockets; they can go out and buy their OHIP or their extended health care and so forth. They get a calculated amount that supposedly is worked out to be an equitable amount to full-time employees.

The second thing is vacations. In many of our part-time agreements, it already says that a part-time employee's vacation pay will be based on a percentage equivalent to that of full-time employees: 4 per cent, two weeks vacation; 6 per cent equals three weeks and so on. If you then say that a part-time employee has to work 2080 hours (equal to one year of full-time employment) to even get to the 4 per cent or the 6 per cent, after three years, vacation and so forth it means really a double whammy for the part-time employee. They have to work almost a one-and-a-half-time factor, in terms of work-time, to even get to the same equivalent in vacation pay earnings as a full-time employee. Now I know these are sort of complicated negotiating techniques and negotiating issues that many of us have run across, but I am just advising this Convention and this Committee that you have hit the nail on the head, but you have bent the nail in the wrong direction, I suggest. We have got to cover part-time employees, we have got to cover them equitably and we have got to cover them, so that the employer pays the same amount per hour of work to part-time employees as to the full-time employees. If they do not, you know who is going to be replaced by whom and this resolution does not do that.

MR. R. SUTTON (Steelworkers): It was our local that first wrote this Resolution L-18 and I would like to move that it be referred with instructions to bring it back as originally written.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The motion to refer has been made and there is a support for that. I will put the question. All those in favour of the referral of Resolution L-18. Hands down. Opposed. The motion to refer is carried.

MR. C. PILKEY (Legislation Committee Chairperson): Resolution L-30, amended.

> "WHEREAS criminal law in Canada perceives a person innocent until proven guilty; and
>
> "WHEREAS labour law in Canada in cases of wrongful dismissal does not reflect innocence until proven guilty;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress and its affiliated unions launch a consolidated campaign to insist that governments in Canada implement changes to labour laws that will allow aggrieved workers in all cases of dismissal the right to continue to work until the case is decided by arbitration".

MS. J. LANGAN (Legislative Committee Secretary): I second.

MR. D. GAGNON (President, UPCE): I am here on a point of privilege and I would like to get some instruction from you, Sister Chairperson. When we move a resolution back to the Committee, can you tell us if that resolution will come back on the floor during the week of this Convention?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We are going to make every attempt, that is why we have a night session on Wednesday to try and complete the business of the Convention; and we shall let you know every morning what the proceedings will be for that day.

On Resolution L-30, the Committee recommends concurrence with an amendment. Is there anyone on the question? All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please show. Any opposed. The motion is carried.

MS. J. LANGAN (Legislative Committee Secretary): The next resolution is Resolution L-10, strike-breaking and Canada Employment Centres. The Committee recommends concurrence.

"WHEREAS the Canada Employment and Immigration Committee management requires its workers to process job orders from employers engaged in a strike and/or lockout; and

"WHEREAS this is an affront to the trade union principles of many of these workers; and

"WHEREAS such activity clearly places the CEIC in the position of being an ally of such employers;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress demand that the federal government stop processing work (job) orders from employers who are engaged in a strike and/or lock-out situation".

MR. C. PILKEY (Legislative Committee Chairperson): I second.

MS. A. WEST (PSAC, CEIU): I work in a Canada Employment and Immigration office. This resolution is of a great concern to the members that I represent. It means that whenever there is a lock-out or a labour dispute involved in any of these situations, our members are asked to refer people to these jobs. What happens is that we are forced to scab and I think that is totally unreasonable; we should not have to be put in that position where we must send people out to these jobs. In British Columbia we had a prime example of a very long, bitter labour dispute at Amtex Doors and the office that handled that job order was told that they had to refer these people to these jobs and they were scab jobs, that is exactly what they were. The employer has every intention of cutting wages, of cutting the benefits, of getting the union out of the workplace. Because we happen to work in the public service and that happens to be part of our jobs, referring people to jobs, and goodness knows there are not many of those, we were told we had to do it. I, as a union member, resent the fact that I am told that this is what I must do. I do not want to be a scab nor do the members that I represent want to be scabs. I urge you, brothers and sisters, to support this resolution unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you, I see no other speakers at the microphones. I will call the question. All those in favour of the adoption of Resolution L-10 please show. Any opposed, please show now. Motion is carried and thank you very much.

The Convention adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1986
Morning Session

Secretary-Treasurer Shirley Carr called the Convention to order at 9:35 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I would like to introduce another guest, Ms. Raya Retig who is a member of the Executive Bureau and Chairperson of the Social Security Department of Histadrut.

I would also like to remind you that nomination papers must be filed in the nominations box on the podium on the platform. Nominations close at 5:30 on Wednesday afternoon, and nominations will not be accepted after that closing time; the papers are available on the platform.

I now call upon the Credentials Committee to give their second report.

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

MR. I. REILLY (Credentials Committee Chairperson): The second report of the Credentials Committee:

Fraternal delegates	3
ICFTU representative	1
Congress Officers	4
Representatives of affiliated organizations	91
Officers and delegates from Federations of Labour and Labour Councils	106
Representatives from affiliated organizations	2,557
Representatives of directly chartered unions	8
TOTAL	2,770

I move the acceptance of this report.

MS. L. NICHOLSON (Credentials Committee Secretary): I second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): You heard the second report of the Credentials Committee moved and seconded. All those in favour of receiving the second report of the Credentials Committee, please signify. Opposed. Adopted.

Bob White will give you the orders of the day.

MR. R. WHITE (General Vice-President, CLC): Today, we shall start with the Economic Policy Statement of the Executive Council which is document no. 18. After Ed Broadbent's speech, the next report will be the report of the Committee on Political Education, Document 12. At approximately 12:00 noon, we shall have the report of the Committee on Economic Policy, Document 2. After lunch, we will have the report of the Women's Committee, Document 16; then the report of the Committee on General Resolutions, Document 5. At approximately 4:00 p.m. we shall have the International Affairs Policy Statement of the Executive Council, Document 20, followed by the report of the Committee on International Affairs, Document 8.

That is the general order of the day. However the time-table will depend on the length of discussion. We shall do this each morning, so that you will have an idea of the order in which we expect to proceed.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I now call upon the Economic Policy Committee to report on the Economic Policy Statement of the Executive Council. First, there will be a short video before the introduction of the statement.

(Video presentation on the Canadian economy)

MR. J. FRYER (Economic Policy Committee Chairperson): I would like to present the paper to you this morning. We shall be dealing with document no. 18, which is entitled "Full Employment and Fairness — the Workers' Agenda for Canada".

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND FAIRNESS — THE WORKERS' AGENDA FOR CANADA

1. Introduction

"There is a crisis in Canadian society. It is now clear to anyone who examines the evidence that the economic policies practised by governments are not working to make life better for most Canadians.

"The recession caused widespread unemployment, falling living standards and rising poverty, cutbacks in social programs and other services and layoffs in both the private and public sectors, as well as attacks on trade unions and basic trade union rights.

"The worst features of that recession continue. And all around us we see the rise of a right-wing ideology that tries to blame workers for the problems of the economy, even as workers are the main victims.

"Business has argued that government spending has worsened the crisis. They argue that social programs are too generous. Business argues, as well, that government regulations hinder efficiency, and that workers have been asking for too much out of the system.

"The business solution to our problems is clear — reduce the deficit, cut spending on social programs, reduce the size of the public sector, cut government regulation of all kinds; change the tax system so that more money is going to corporations and more of the burdens of government are being borne by ordinary Canadians: reduce the wages and living standards of average Canadians through unemployment and through reducing the power of working people to bargain fair wage and benefit increases. All so that Canada will be more 'competitive'.

"In short, return to the 'market'.

"In the climate of fear and uncertainty felt by most workers, corporations have been able to reorganize, to shed labour, to lower labour costs and to try to get a more compliant labour force.

"It is time to challenge this corporate agenda, with a new agenda, based on the needs and the wishes of the vast majority of Canadians.

"We who are not responsible for this crisis, we who are forced to pay the costs, must demonstrate the imagination and the will to build an alternative economic strategy.

"This alternative strategy must be built on full employment and fairness. It must focus on creating jobs, not on undermining jobs and security; it must promote socially useful investment and not reward financial speculation and profit-taking; it must focus on raising real wages and living standards, not undermining them to provide a favourable investment climate; it must value and promote public services; it must be built on publicly controlled democratic, economic planning. Finally, it must be built on solidarity — among workers, and between workers and others in our community who have also suffered from the failures of the present economic policies.

"The challenge of the rest of this century will be to create economic democracy in Canada, to broaden the effectiveness of our democratic institutions against a philosophy that would substitute corporate power for economic and social democracy.

"Nothing short of a complete restructuring of the Canadian economy will do.

"To do this we need a workers' agenda, to replace the agenda of capital.

"Labour's action plan must include the following elements:

A. Mobilizing the Trade Union Movement

"In order to begin restructuring Canada we need to mobilize the trade union movement around a program of hope, of action, of change powerful enough to represent workers and others victimized by the corporate agenda.

Social Solidarity: We will work to build links around a common program with other groups in society that are also under attack.

Organizing the Unorganized: We rededicate ourselves, at the national level, and at the level of each of our affiliates, to bringing the unorganized into the House of Labour and offering them the protection and benefits that can only come from collective action.

Unity in the Trade Union Movement: We will redouble our efforts to bring all working people, and their organizations, into the House of Labour.

Job Security: We will offer support — financial, organizational and educational — to all unions fighting to maintain job security.

Affirmative Action: We will continue the campaign of affirmative action to demand for women their fair share of the economic and social rewards of our society. We will continue to make affirmative action including pay equity a high priority in our educational programs, and we will continue to assist all affiliates to develop a strong, co-ordinated and detailed agenda that puts affirmative action at the heart of our collective bargaining strategy. Affirmative action programs for native people, visible minorities and the disabled are also central issues for working people. No longer is it tolerable for people in these groups to be deprived of their rights.

Shorter Work Time: We rededicate ourselves to the fight for shorter working time including a national legislated ban on overtime, a shorter work week, improved parental leave, better vacation time, and earlier retirement and better pensions.

Concessions: We will continue to oppose concessions in any form, including wage controls.

International Solidarity: We will continue to assist our brothers and sisters in other countries in their fight for social justice.

Political Action: We rededicate ourselves to support the New Democratic Party as the party that speaks for working men and women in Canada.

B. Changing Government Policy

"The basic assumptions of economic policy in Canada have to be changed. For too long, corporations and governments have treated workers as if they were part of the problem; we must demonstrate with our unity around a new economic strategy, that we are part of the solution, and that we have the answers and the imagination that they do not have.

A Full Employment Society: We will demand that the government develop economic policy that puts full employment first, and that it develop targets designed to reduce unemployment as quickly as possible.

Tax Reform: We will launch a major campaign to back tax reform, and will work with our political allies on a detailed agenda of tax reform, as an alternative to the 'trickle down' theories and corporate tax incentives that are pushed by the corporate sector.

Interest Rates: We will continue our campaign against higher interest rates, and put pressure on government to take control of our monetary policy and use interest rates in the interest of Canadians, to develop the economy.

Investment Policy: We will work to mobilize the trade union movement around a campaign to promote public control and democratization of the investment process.

Public Ownership: We will oppose privatization of existing publicly-owned enterprises, and we will work to extend public ownership to other areas, including the financial and resource sectors.

Canada-U.S. Free Trade: We dedicate ourselves to continue the

fight against Canada-U.S. Free trade, as a united labour movement, concerned about jobs and working conditions, and the survival and independence of our nation.

Deregulation: We will carry the fight against deregulation forward, with a co-ordinated national campaign designed to stop the trend of deregulation dead in its tracks.

Social Programs: We will continue our fight to preserve medicare, and will fight against privatization of medical facilities, and against extra-billing and user fees across the country. We will organize ourselves to defend and improve the unemployment insurance program. We will work to see that not only vital programs are not cut back, but to see that they are extended, and that the principle of universality is protected, we will fight to preserve and improve public pensions. We are united, too, in our fight to defend public services and programs against privatization and contracting-out.

Basic Trade Union Rights: Everywhere, basic trade union rights are under attack. Whatever the cost, and whatever the time involved, we will continue the fight to preserve and extend basic trade union rights against groups like the National Citizens' Coalition, for it is a fight for the future of the trade union movement in Canada.

"With this workers' agenda we will work to give the victims of the continuing recession hope for the future, to make them aware of the tremendous power and strength of collective organization and action.

2. A Corporate Recovery, But No People's Recovery

"After the most severe economic downturn since the Great Depression, some parts of our economy have recovered.

"Economic growth last year was over four per cent; the year before it was about five per cent.

"Inflation is now at around four per cent, a level which Canadians have not seen since the early 1970s.

"Corporate profits have rebounded.

"For some, then, there has been a recovery, but for many there has not.

"Although the government and the business community proclaimed the recession was over at the end of 1982, the official rate of unemployment (February 1986) is still in the range of 10 per cent, and the real rates of unemployment remain much higher.

"The cost of that official unemployment, in purely economic terms, amount to about $53 billion in lost output in 1985 alone, and will amount to another $53 billion in 1986 — a figure which dwarfs the deficit and puts into perspective workers' demands that their need for jobs must come before the business community's desire for fiscal restraint.

"As of January 1986 there were just under 1.3 million officially unemployed. With the hidden unemployed the figure is much higher; and the numbers of long-term unemployed remain unacceptably high.

"The unemployment rates for youth are still one and a half times the overall rate, at 15.9 per cent. During the recession about 360,000 jobs for young people disappeared. Only about 130,000 of them have been recovered.

"The unemployment rates for some regions of the country remain at depression levels.

"Since the beginning of the recession there has been an erosion of full-time jobs in favour of part-time jobs. From the eve of the recession to the beginning of 1986, the workforce grew by about 580,000 jobs. Of these 230,000 are full-time, and the remaining 350,000 are part-time. Today, nearly one in six jobs in our economy is part-time.

"For seven consecutive years the growth of wages has failed to keep pace with the rise in the cost of living.

"According to the most recent statistics, wage increases continue to lag behind the rate of inflation. This is among the unionized workforce; the situation for unorganized workers is even worse. This long decline in real purchasing power accounts for much of the recent economic slump. Its reversal is a necessary condition for sustained growth.

"Nearly one-sixth of our population has an income below the poverty line, and women, the aged and the single-parent families are disproportionately represented among the poor.

"The recovery, in short has touched some, but it has not been felt by many in our society. While the costs of the recession were born by the workers of Canada, the benefits are being felt by others in our society.

3. The Conservative Agenda

"In spite of the continuing problems in our economy, the federal government is following a strategy which will make the distribution of benefits and privileges in our society even less equal. It is a strategy designed to reduce the role of government and to turn over the power to decide our future to the forces of the market.

"The elements of that strategy include:

- The willingness to tolerate unacceptably high levels of unemployment;
- The willingness to see wages and working conditions reduced to levels that are 'competitive' with those in other countries;
- A reliance on the market to set economic priorities, which has led to deregulation, privatization of government enterprises and contracting-out of government services, cutbacks in government programs and services, and initiatives for free trade with the United States;
- Making deficit-reduction a higher priority than social progress, in order to please the business community and international investors; and shifting the tax burden from corporations to individuals, and from wealthy individuals to the lower and middle class.

"This is the 'new reality' that so many politicians and business people are now talking about. It is, in fact, a return to an older reality, where unemployment was natural and inevitable; soup kitchens and food banks were universal, and 'self-reliance' was the watchword.

"This is a philosophy with which we profoundly disagree.

"The market-oriented philosophy which is currently dominant in government and in the business community amounts to a fundamental attack on workers' living standards, and on their basic rights, both in government and at the bargaining table.

"The best example of this economic strategy can be seen in the last two federal budgets, which will result in personal and sales taxes rising by $7 billion next year, while corporate taxes will actually fall. The result will be a continuation of the shift in the burden of supporting the costs of government, away from corporations and toward individuals.

"We are told that market-oriented policies are necessary to restore the economy to health; we are told that these changes are for our own good.

"Neither of these claims are true.

"In fact, it becomes increasingly clear that this agenda, far from solving our problems, will only make them worse.

"Leaving the investment priorities of our society in the hands of the private sector has meant a preoccupation with the export of unprocessed raw materials and an unwillingness to put suffi-

cient money into job-creating investments elsewhere in the economy.

"It has meant a preoccupation, as well, with 'competitiveness' that has resulted in attempts to cut wages and benefits, to worsen working conditions, and to weaken union rights and collective bargaining.

"At the bargaining table we see attempts in both the public and private sectors to extract concessions, to roll back wages and working conditions, vacations, employment levels; we see cutbacks in staff through layoffs or through attrition, while demands for overtime increase; contracting-out in the public sector; erosion of job security; the replacement of full-time jobs with part-time jobs, with temporary and casual jobs, at low wages, low benefits and no job security.

"Reducing the bargaining power of working people has not only depressed living standards and raised unemployment, it has provoked a further crisis in government finances, as revenues fall and expenditures rise. This crisis gets worse as governments try in vain to bribe corporations with more and more tax handouts to lead us out of the crisis.

"Deregulation will eliminate the minimum standards which protect us all from shoddy goods and from price-fixing and monopoly power, from health and safety violations, environmental problems, and the downgrading of labour standards.

"Transport deregulation will put at risk large numbers of jobs, it will risk the safety of our people, and cause deterioration in service, safety and convenience for many communities and regions of our country.

"With deregulation and telecommunications, the cost of essential services may rise to the point where many will not be able to afford them — all to satisfy the business community who want lower rates and higher profits.

"Deregulation in the financial sector, the removal of controls on foreign investment, the repeal of the National Energy Program, will put more and more of the economy in the hands of the private decision-makers concerned only with profits.

"Free trade wil mean turning our economy over to the large corporations, who will be free to export and import goods, to move their operations without regard to jobs, communities, the welfare of working people. It will mean risks to our sovereignty — political, economic and cultural — and it will put at risk our social programs, our economic programs, our regional development programs, all the programs we have put in place to promote economic development and to protect the weak and vulnerable.

"Privatization has meant selling off public assets at fire-sale rates, and turning important public services into private, profit-making operations. It has meant no new jobs, no benefits to the public.

"Deficit-reduction has already resulted in the cutting of social programs in order to stimulate business confidence, and is likely to mean further cuts in health care, unemployment insurance, universal education, and other essential programs. The deficit-reduction announced in the February 1986 budget will reduce outlays on programs needed by many in our society to the share of our national income that they were at 25 years ago.

"The search for lower deficits has already resulted in widespread public sector 'restraint', which has meant wage cuts, layoffs of public workers, deterioration in working conditions in the public sector, and the reduction of vital services to the community.

"More than ever it is clear that *the problems are economic and social, the solutions are political*.

4. The Workers' Agenda — Full Employment and Fairness

"More than ever, it has become clear to workers that what Canadians need is a new strategy which meets our needs, not the needs of capital.

"At the heart of such a strategy must be a commitment to *full employment* and to *fairness* in the distribution of the wealth of our society, through improved living standards, through improved public services and income security programs, and through the use of public policies and democratically controlled public investment to plan our economic development.

"As a movement, we can influence governments to pass legislation and to enact government policy that favours workers rather than corporations. We can work with like-minded progressive organizations in our communities to influence government decisions. But if we are to secure our future, we must go beyond this, and we must begin to use our resources, as workers, to begin to build the kinds of institutions, the kinds of enterprises that will be the foundation for a new society.

"We need, as workers, to be able to outline our own economic agenda for Canada. We need to take the agenda back into our workforces, and begin to build the support among working people for a workers' agenda that will turn both the politics and the economics of Canada around.

A. Mobilizing the Trade Union Movement

"In order to achieve our goals, either through legislation or at the bargaining table, we need to strengthen the trade union movement so that it has the ability to speak for all working Canadians.

"We must continue to reach out to other groups in the community and practice social solidarity. Dialogue '86 was an example of such efforts which we pledge to continue.

"We must organize the unorganized. All through the recession, we have been successful in achieving growth through organization. The organized now represent about 40 per cent of the paid work force. We have made progress in the face of adversity. Now we must continue to organize, to extend the benefits of collective bargaining and collective strength to all working people.

"We must reach out to other working class organizations and bring them into the House of Labour. Only a united labour movement has the strength to develop and enforce a workers' agenda for the future of Canada.

"We must strengthen our ability to win change at the bargaining table. The collective bargaining system is the cutting edge of social change, for many of the things that working people have won at the bargaining table have later been made available to all through the political system. It is through collective bargaining that many of our members will achieve job security. It is through collective bargaining that the goals of affirmative action, including pay equity, will be realized for many of our members. At the bargaining table we need to fight against overtime, and we must fight for shorter working hours, better vacations, a shorter working life, as ways of reducing unemployment and finding jobs, especially for our younger people, many of whom face the possibility of a lifetime without steady employment. It is at the bargaining table, and through the use of our collective strength as a united labour movement, that we will succsesfully deal with the demands for concessions and rollbacks. On all these issues we must remain united as a labour movement, and dedicated to collective action through collective bargaining.

"We need to use our strength as a working class organization to get social and economic justice:

- We need to get control of our pension funds so they can be used for socially useful and job-creating purposes;
- We need to place an emphasis on local community development, on the creation of jobs in our own communities and on the development of secondary industries around our resources;

- We need to develop an action plan to create and support unionized worker co-ops as a form of economic development.

"International solidarity is as critical to our future as solidarity within Canada. While there are still many parts of the world where workers are oppressed, where wages and working conditions are inadequate and where workers are not allowed to live in dignity, then workers everywhere are less than free. Our organizational help, our financial help, our help in influencing government policy must be given freely to our brothers and sisters everywhere who are struggling for justice.

"What is gained at the bargaining table is often lost because of government policies that victimize workers and blame them for the economic failures of governments and business. A united and mobilized labour movement must be united as well around support for labour's party and a determination to see it achieve the kinds of victories that will bring economic and social policies designed to further the cause of working people.

B. Government Policy

"Every government program and policy must be tested against its impact on jobs, income security and equality.

"A commitment to full employment must come first, since it is the economic foundation of all the other policies; all fiscal and monetary policies should be put to the test of their impact on job creation leading to full employment.

"The realities of the deficit must be stated, from a worker's point of view, and not from a business point of view.

First, deficit financing has been essential to sustain aggregate demand, and jobs, in the economy. Without the deficit, the recession would have been much worse.

Second, much of this spending has been necessary to deal with the consequences of a deep recession and a weak recovery, because of the increasing numbers of unemployed poor.

Third, much of the deficit is the result of lost tax revenues, because of the poor state of the economy.

Fourth, some have not paid their share. In recent years, while personal income taxes have been raised, and while sales taxes have been increased, corporate taxes have been lowered and the burden of taxation has been shifted both from wealthier individuals to the less well off, and from the corporate sector to individuals.

"We need thorough tax reform, a thorough review of our personal and corporate income tax system is long overdue in the interest of raising more revenue from those who can afford to pay, ensuring fairness in the tax system and providing more revenues for essential public programs and services. Tax reform designed to make the personal income tax system genuinely progressive should be a high priority.

"There is no better place to start on reforming the tax system than with tax expenditures. The Auditor General has estimated that the annual cost of tax expenditures in the range of $35 to $50 billion; and there is no real accountability for the fairness, need, effectiveness or size of these tax measures. For a government concerned with wasteful spending, examining these tax expenditures, especially in terms of their impact on job-creation, should be a high priority.

"Reviewing recent decisions to increase personal and sales taxes should also be a high priority. We need a new injection of consumer demand in the economy that should come from reversing the negative effect of the personal income tax and sales tax increases in the last two budgets.

"A serious review of revenues and spending would show much opportunity for raising revenues by taxing those who can afford to pay more, and for redirecting spending from private sector bailouts and giveaways into needed public services and job creation.

"The government cannot argue that 'the money isn't there' to justify the $2 billion cut in transfers to the provinces for health and post-secondary education, while on the other hand, it proceeds with:

- The Western Accords which involve $9 billion in benefits and tax breaks to the oil industry over the next five years.
- Increased tax deductions favouring wealthy Canadians through capital gains and RRSP changes, amount to nearly $2 billion a year in new tax breaks by 1990.
- Over $2 billion in special tax breaks to Gulf, Dome and Syncrude.
- Bank bailouts which will cost between $1 and $2 billion.
- Fire sale prices on De Havilland and other government-owned enterprises, which amount to giving away public property at far below its real value to private entrepreneurs.

"Interest rates must be lowered; high interest rates have the ability to destroy the health of the economy and put us back into recession. A 'Made in Canada' interest rate policy would put interest rates and monetary policy into perspective as part of the arsenal of weapons to fight unemployment and to create permanent jobs.

"We need a new round of job-creating public spending, like the proposal from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, which put together a $12 billion inventory of municipal works, infrastructure, and the building of affordable housing.

"In the past we have called for spending on co-op, low income and non-profit housing; improvements in urban transit, investments in rail facilities and marine transportation; hospitals, schools and public recreational facilities; sewage disposal and water treatment; major reforestation and conservation programs in all areas which depend on the forest for jobs; research and investment in pollution equipment and in ways to control acid rain.

"All of these projects remain important social needs and they are needs which are less and less likely to be filled by a government which has become transfixed by deficit-reduction and spending cutbacks.

"Beyond this, we need a redirection of capital investment, as part of a strategy of democratic control of economic development. Private sector investment has failed to meet our needs as a society; it has made worse the problems of regional disparities, tied us to raw materials' exports rather than the processing of our materials in our own country, and stunted the growth of our manufacturing sector. A strategy of redirecting capital investment will place an emphasis on increasing our self-sufficiency through encouraging import substitution and the development of secondary industries around our resources.

"Such a redirection of capital investment will mean asserting public control over banking and financial institutions to ensure that our savings are used to create jobs, strengthen the economy and, ultimately, give us more control over our own destiny. It will also mean more public control over investment decisions. It is clear that it has been a mistake to give more and more say to private investors, who have invested in areas that create no jobs, produce no socially useful goods. Publicly controlled investment must focus on broader concerns than simple profitability — the jobs content of the investment, the social usefulness of the products and services, the needs of communities, the possibilities for skill development for workers arising from the investment.

"As well, there must be less freedom for corporations to shift investment, to close down plants and to lay off workers. The trade union mouvement must demand that the right to a job will come before the right to close a plant or to shift investment.

"Companies must not be allowed to introduce technological

change without consulting the employees whose jobs will be affected. Workers will demand that companies must justify such decisions, that they be forced to pen their books, that they be forced to give adequate notice to affected workers, adequate compensation for retraining, relocation, severance pay and compensation to the community affected. As well, we will fight to have a say in job-design and in the design of our workplaces, as a way of ensuring that our jobs are secure, that our workplaces are safe and that workers are guaranteed a fair share of the benefits of technological change.

"Public ownership is a key element in a strategy of pubic control over investment. We will campaign to stop the privatization of publicly owned companies like De Havilland, Canadair, Air Canada, CN, Canadian Arsenals, Petrocan, and other Crown corporations. Beyond this defensive campaign, we will work to build support for public ownership in our resource sector, in the financial sector, and in other key sectors of our economy.

"The government must reverse its disastrous move toward free trade with the United States which will cost hundreds of thousands of jobs and threaten the independence of our country.

"Workers in virtually every industry in Canada have already come to the conclusion that free trade will mean massive job loss, and that it will also mean the loss of social programs, the loss of regional development programs, and the loss of many legal protections that cannot be justified by 'competitiveness' or the dictates of the market.

"Workers know, as well, that free trade with the United States could mean the end of Canada as an independent country. Our sovereignty — cultural, political and economic — could be swept away.

"We have already begun to fight back against this strategy which is only another way of turning more of our economy over to the 'market'. We will continue the fight with education campaigns, with demonstrations, with alliances and coalitions with other groups in our society who are also opposed to free trade with the United States.

"We need a reversal, as well, of the move toward deregulation.

"Deregulation of transportation in the United States has caused serious problems with safety, with service to many communities, and with job-loss. In the airline industry, concentration of ownership has begun to increase; in the trucking industry, similar problems of concentration have begun to appear. In all the transportation sectors, deregulation has brought with it cutthroat competition, instability and bankruptcy. The result has been widespread attempts to roll back union security, working conditions, wages and jobs.

"In Canada, we can expect that all the problems with transport deregulation will appear in even worse form, because of our small population and larger size.

"We will continue the campaign against transport deregulation with organizational and financial help, and with educational material designed to bring the problems of deregulation before working people and to mobilize them round a fight back campaign.

"In the telecommunications field, deregulation has meant large job losses, concession demands, attacks on trade union security. It has meant, also, that the price of some basic telephone services has risen to the point where some cannot afford them.

"Again, we can expect that the effects of deregulation in Canada will be similar or worse. We will continue our campaign to put the facts of deregulation in the telecommunications field before ordinary Canadians; and to organize workers around a campaign to protect their jobs, their union security, and the services available to the general public.

"We need a commitment to the maintenance and expansion of social programs; spending on social programs must be declared off limits in any efforts to cut spending; and the principle of universality must be defended as the only acceptable way to deliver social programs.

"In the field of social policy Canada remains a miserly spender on social programs. In 1984, Canada would have had to spend an additional $20 billion on social programs just to reach the middle ranks of industrialized countries in terms of the proportion of our national wealth devoted to social programs. In terms of public pension programs, child care, minimum income protection, income for the disabled, and adjustment programs for older workers, Canada's social programs are totally inadequate. With the aging of our population, in particular, and with the continuing high rates of unemployment caused by failures in government economic policies, the need is for more social spending, not less.

"We will continue to work with other groups in our society, to mobilize public opinion against cutbacks in social programs, such as the attempt to de-index old age pensions and the moves to de-index family allowances. We will continue to build the case for an expansion of our social programs; improved child care programs, for instance, are an urgent necessity. Canada cannot afford to be without a high quality, universally accessible, publicly funded day care system. Nor can we afford, as a society, to be without a system of high quality, adequately funded and adequately regulated nursing care. There are only two examples of social spending that must be extended, not cut back.

"We must fight against attempts by the federal government to reduce its deficits by cutting transfer payments to the provinces, thus putting in jeopardy our universal medicare system and the quality of our post-secondary education system.

"We put the government on notice, as well, that the working people of Canada will not stand for any cutbacks in the unemployment insurance program. The protests that the government has seen to date over other cutbacks will be minor compared to the level of protest that the working people of Canada will mount against any cutbacks in the U.I. program.

"Workers demand from government a commitment to equality in the workplace, so that men and women are treated equally, and paid the same amount for work of equal value. Affirmative action, including pay equity, is an integral part of an overall economic strategy to raise the living standards and security of ordinary Canadians.

"We will continue to pressure governments for legislation to ban overtime, to shorten the work week and to increase vacations and other forms of time off the job, both as a way of sharing the wealth created by technological change and rising productivity, and as a way of creating more jobs, especially for young people. A one-hour reduction in average weekly hours could open up as many as a half-million jobs.

"Basic trade union rights in Canada are in danger. While groups like the National Citizens' Coalition are free to attack the very concept of working people joining collectively to fight collective battles and to work toward collective goals, the rights of all working people are in danger. We will continue to fight these attacks, as a trade union movement, and we will demand that governments at all levels provide the kinds of legal protection for trade unions and trade union rights that are basic to a civilized society. We will not give up on this issue and we will not hold back the resources necessary to continue the battle for what is at stake is the future of the trade union movement and the rights of working people.

5. A Future of Hope

"The economic policies followed by business and governments have resulted in a loss of hope in the future.

"They are policies which have resulted in economic and social waste — high unemployment, huge inequities in wealth and income, vast amounts of lost output, social problems, wasted lives.

"The workers' agenda is a plan for the future, based on full employment and fairness.

"It is a plan based on the needs of the vast majority of Canadians, and it is designed to provided them with the jobs they need, the economic security they need, and a sense that they are working for their future, and the future of their children.

"The workers' agenda is based on solidarity — among workers, between workers and others who have been victimized by a system designed to return riches to the few at the expense of the many, between workers in Canada and workers elsewhere in the world.

"The time has come for the failed agenda to be replaced. The time has come for the workers of Canada to begin building their future.

"To carry forward this agenda, we dedicate ourselves to unity, and to the mobilization and commitment necessary to make it a reality."

MR. J. FRYER (Economic Policy Committee Chairperson): On behalf of the Committee, seconded by the Secretary of the Committee, we present this Statement on Economic Policy to the delegates for their consideration.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): It has been moved and readily seconded, concurrence in document no. 18, "Full Employment and Fairness — The Workers' Agenda for Canada." We shall now open the debate.

MS. N. RICHE (Secretary-Treasurer, NUPGE): I rise in support of this document and repeat the title, "Full Employment and Fairness — The Workers' Agenda for Canada". The key words in this paper are the words "the workers' agenda".

As we mentioned yesterday, we are putting all of our energies and resources into fighting the Conservatives' federal and provincial agenda on free trade, deregulation, privatization and contracting-out. We must have a workers' agenda, and the cornerstone of that workers' agenda is full employment.

Looking at one aspect of full employment alone — i.e. pay equity — full employment policies, in fact, actually serve to reduce the gap in pay between men and women. In Canada, women earn roughly 64 cents for every dollar that men earn. Yet, in Sweden, where women average 90 per cent of men's earnings, the unemployment rate has averaged two per cent for more than 40 years. We need a government that really cares about jobs.

When asked to implement full employment policies, the Mulroney government's response is that plenty of job opportunities should result from the strong economic recovery which Canada is currently experiencing. No doubt the figures show that this economic recovery is taking place, but for whom? Where are the jobs? Where is the percentage of wage increases? How come our members are facing layoffs? How come the number of poor in Canada keeps increasing?

What we have is economic recovery for the corporate sector but not for the working people of Canada. The only way that we can change this situation is by electing a government that reflects the interest of workers, that believes in full employment as a first economic priority, and that is committed to sharing equitably the benefits of economic growth amongst all Canadians, a government that believes in the workers' agenda. I would just repeat one line, on page 5: "A united and mobilized labour movement must be united to see it achieve the kinds of victories that will bring economic and social policies designed to further the cause of working people".

That is our challenge and I think we are up to it.

MS. J. THORKELSON (UFAWU): I am the president of the Prince Rupert Labour Council, and I am a member of the Executive Council of the B.C. Federation of Labour.

Yesterday, we heard about the three corporate policies, outlining a common philosophy of big business, which is an attack on labour to vastly increase their profits. We heard that we must mobilize the labour movement and we must mobilize community groups; we must mobilize everybody into the largest alliance we can create in order to attack and defeat that corporate program of increasing their profits at our expense. Intrinsic to that fight is the fact that we must provide an alternative working program that we can present as a workers' and a people's alternative. This paper provides us with the method of bringing to the community a program of action to create a society that does the job for people instead of for corporations and their corporate profits in order to make the people in power more powerful and far wealthier. I fully endorse this paper, and I fully endorse the decision of the Canadian Labour Congress Convention to take this program out in a grand fighting style with the leadership of the CLC and in a grand militant style that we have shown in other fight-back programs such as the program against interest rates, and the program that we had against Trudeau's wage and price controls.

This is, however, in direct opposition, unfortunately, to another program which the CLC is involved in, i.e. the Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre. We cannot confuse the two; we cannot sit on the Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre, which is a large "quality circle" where the stated aim is to enhance productivity and see how that can be best achieved as an equal partnership between business and labour.

The Canadian Productivity Centre is set up in Ottawa to see how workers can become more productive. I am a productive worker. In my industry, in my town, we have only 75 per cent of the people left; 25 per cent are gone in the fishing industry because we have made ourselves so productive with the increase in technology, that we are no longer needed. Our town has 30 per cent unemployment because of increased productivity; what has that done for me?

The same people sit on the Board of Directors and form part of the Business Council of National Issues, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Manufacturing Association, the Canadian Federation of Independent Businesses. In adopting a program yesterday, and in adopting that paper today, the CLC has no business sitting on a council that is deciding how I can become more productive. Business knows that they become more productive; they cut my wages, they take my health and safety and they put my brothers and sisters on the rolls of the unemployment list.

People in my industry are on welfare. In my husband's union, the Carpenter's Union, for two years, in Prince Rupert, men have been on welfare. There are no jobs, welfare is a reality for every one of those people. Those people are darn well productive. And I insist, in the adoption of this paper, that we get this Canadian Labour Congress off boards discussing productivity with the bosses and, instead, take this militant program of action, which is the best program of action the CLC will have adopted, take it out into the community, and fight so that we get our program adopted, and not that of big business.

MS. C. BAIRD (CUPE): I am certainly not here to stand against the document presented before you. I find it a very commendable document, and I support it thoroughly; however, I would hope that it would be extended. At the moment, the North York Public Library system, which is one of the largest public libraries in Canada, is under direct attack from a U.S. management consultant firm, who is going right through our whole library system. This firm has already approved the installation of a computer system, which will cost well over three million dollars.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): There is a point of order on mike 6.

MR. A. KUBE (President, B.C. Federation of Labour): The only people who can speak on a con mike are the people who

are opposed to the document. I object to someone in favour of the document lining up at a con mike.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Sister Baird, you have to speak to the document. You are at a con mike, and if that means that you are against the document, then so be it; otherwise, I would suggest that you go to a pro mike and wait in line.

MS. C. BAIRD (CUPE): I am stating that I am in favour of large portions of the document, but I would only approve of the document with some provision in it to protect the part-time workers. It is not enough just to say "full employment." In the library system and probably in many other groups of people, at the present moment, almost half of the workers are part-timers and when the workers are under attack and laid off, it is the part-time workers' hours that are not maintained.

One of my personal friends in the Peterborough library system worked 24 hours a week. Now, people can live on 24 hours a week if they are very careful, but her working hours were cut down to 10 hours a week. I am suggesting that there be a provision in this document to protect, not only the working hours of people with a 35 or 40-hour week, but also those of the part-time workers, most of whom are women. If this provision is added, then I am in full support of this document.

MR. J.C. PARROT (National President, CUPW): Of course, I support the document. It is another very good analysis of the present situation, but I would like to address myself more particularly to page 2, Section A.

This section speaks of mobilizing the trade union movement and outlines a program divided into several points. I was very proud, this morning, to read in the papers that the Catholic bishops were supporting us. Not so long ago, they stated that men and women workers and people in general should come before profits. Their declaration in support of the trade union movement is most encouraging and definitely deserves our admiration.

As to social solidarity, we had Dialogue '86, at which many social participants met to discuss various questions. It is most important that the CLC find ways to maintain that kind of relations on a continued basis, not only for the duration of a conference but throughout the year.

The document also speaks of unity in the trade union movement and of the fact that we must redouble our efforts to bring all men and women workers into the House of Labour. This must be strongly encouraged, including the whole matter of organizing the unorganized. Important battles were waged, these past two years; the Eaton's and Visa workers, for instance. It is important not only to give more intensive financial and moral support like we did over the past two years, but, in addition, perhaps consider holding meetings of all union officers of the country in order to organize in a more efficient way, not only support to the men and women who are struggling, but campaigns to support them.

As to job security, the document speaks of offering financial, organizational, and educational support to all unions fighting to maintain job security. Once more, this is definitely a must, but we must also develop efficient means to maintain the job security of our own people. I am thinking of job-creating programs, for instance. During our last negotiations, although our employer had stated that we could not tell them where they should invest their money, we were successful in having them agree to increase services to the public, thus creating jobs. It was a breakthrough for us and, of course, we intend to continue in that direction. It proved to be a most efficient offensive against an employer that wants to take away some of our gains and our job security. In the course of the next two years, we ought to be able to develop similar strategies.

As to affirmative action, we must finds ways of publicizing the struggles of the minorities, be they women or others, who do not even have pay equity.

Finally, I wish to draw the attention of the new Executive Council to an important matter. The document brings up again this question of shorter work time, already adopted at the last Convention, with which I entirely agree. But there is a discrepancy between this document and two other documents yet to be submitted to the Convention, which I doubt we shall have the time to discuss; one concerns legislation and the other, organization; and in them we are told that it is too early. I would like the Executive Council to take these points into consideration.

MR. R. BURNS (NUPGE-MGEA): The federal government is cutting health and education by $2 billion a year. Their argument is the deficit, but it is a phoney argument. We all know that Gulf Oil received a $2 billion tax break. We also know that Gulf Oil is spending that money on the acquisition of Hiram Walker.

In response to this cutback of $2 billion a year in health and education we, in Manitoba, formed a coalition composed of anti-poverty associations, associations of students, unions, etc. In the document, where you talk of the need of social solidarity, the CLC Executive should be looking towards forming national coalitions and providing the program and organization that is possible through the CLC's extensive national connections.

MR. W. ZANDER (B.C. Council of Carpenters): We have carpenters from B.C., Alberta and the Yukon here today, and it is the first time in four years that we have been able to attend the CLC Convention. We are here because we know that we belong here, and I hope that the coming administration will work diligently with the building trades to try to bring the rest of them into the House of Labour.

In the industry in which I work in B.C., we have about a 60 per cent rate of unemployment, and we have had over a 50 per cent rate for approximately three years. We know the horror of unemployment and we know the problems caused by the economic policies brought down by both Liberal and Conservative governments but, particularly by the infamous Social Credit Government of B.C. I agree wholeheartedly with the statement that is out before us today, but we have policy, and we have had policy.

The biggest thing lacking in our province of B.C., and also in Canada, is the will to lead the people and the workers in this country to fight for their rights. We have reached a stage in the province that I live in, as you know, where we have lineups of hundreds of people, who, at the end of the line, do not even get their $18-bag of groceries to go home with for that week. At the same time, we have a government that needs to be totally condemned for their economic policies and restraints, when they invest money in Northeast Coal and they dig the hole in the wrong place. It cost $1.15 billion in taxpayers' dollars to dig a hole in the wrong place.

When you talk about bringing coal to Newcastle, just to illustrate some of the economic policies that we have in our province, they bought $500,000 worth of trees for Expo which I believe, came from Illinois, they are now being used as firewood. They have cocktail parties, other parties and opening ceremonies for Expo just up the street from the food bank where people do not have enough to eat. We have situations in our province — and I am sure it applies in other parts of Canada — where people do not have a place to stay because they are being evicted. I do not have to tell you that there are people who are not properly clothed in the winter-time, and some of them are not even in the summer-time. If you look at the people in the streets in the summer-time, you will very often see someone wearing a very heavy coat when it is about 90° in the shade.

We have the policies, we have the support, and we can bring about the kind of coalition that we need to turn things around. We started it with solidarity in B.C. The Catholic Church, the United Church and the Anglican Church have made statements, and, sometimes, I think their statements far supersede the statements that are being made by our trade union movement. And I say that advisedly. We have to be far more audacious. We have the support; but the key is that we have to mobi-

lize not just our union people, but all of the unemployed. In my particular case, I represent more unemployed that I do employed by some considerable extent. We have to go out and do the things that have been identified. We have to educate, agitate and get right into the forums of the Conservatives and the Liberals and other organizations and tell them what we think about what is happening. It is time we took our papers out into the street.

MS. J. DARCY (CUPE): I would like to highlight one of the issues in the Workers' Economic Agenda which affects the members in my union the most, and which also affects every worker in the public sector in this country, whether they work for municipal, provincial, or federal governments, or any other public institution for that matter. The issue is contracting-out and privatization which we talked about yesterday, and which we shall also talk about today when we talk about the need to fight contracting-out and the need to expand public services. There is no local union in CUPE that is immune to the threat of contracting-out and privatization, whether it is in nursing homes, hospitals, municipal government, libraries, etc.

I would like to bring to your attention one particular example of what happened to some of our members just last year, and also to members of another union this year. It occurred just a few blocks away, and I am going to relate this story in order to highlight just what it is we are facing, because there is still a myth in this country that public employees enjoy job security. We do not enjoy job security, and we are in for the fight of our lives in order to hold on to our jobs, much less to expand public services in this country.

I would like to tell you about a situation that took place — and is still taking place — in an office tower just a few blocks from here. It happened last year in the Toronto-Dominion Centre owned by the Cadillac Fairview Corp., not one of the smaller landowners in this country; just a few months ago, with another union, at First Canadian Place owned by Olympia and York, the Reichman Bros., (again, not some of the poorest businessmen in this country). There are workers employed there by cleaning contractors who are mainly Portugese-Canadian women. In our CUPE local last year and again this year, in another union, when those workers' contract came up for re-negotiation, the owner of the building put the cleaning contract up for tender, so that those workers were facing concessions. They were told by the cleaning contractor: "You either settle for an inferior contract, or we shall not win the bidding war, and then you will be out of work." It is an intolerable situation, and it is one that affects the most vulnerable workers in this country. It is a situation where the unions, in the end, are forced to say: "Our choice is between cancer and pneumonia, so we shall take pneumonia, because, at least, maybe we shall live a little longer." In both situations, that is what the workers were forced to do.

I bring this matter to your attention at this time, because the way that we have attempted to organize around that situation is a good example of what it means to put a Workers' Economic Agenda front and centre in the political and economic life of this province and of this country. Our union, in this city and in this province, has been involved in building the kind of grassroots' coalition that this document talks about. We build a coalition between CUPE and the other unions who are affected, i.e. who represent workers in the cleaning industry. There are about 20,000 workers, mainly unorganized, in downtown Toronto, and that is just a fraction of what we are dealing with across the country. We build a grassroots' coalition involving union, Portugese community groups, the New Democratic Party, provincial and municipal politicians, churches and anybody else who would come to our defence. We have been canvassing in the community by going door-to-door and we have organized downtown rallies in front of the office towers in order to bring the situation to the public's attention. Right now, we are involved in a petition campaign which, I hope, later in this Convention, that all of you will support. This petition campaign says to the Liberal government of this province that we want legislation i.e. protection in law, for workers whose jobs are contracted-out, so that, when the cleaning contractor changes, their jobs and their collective agreements would remain.

That is just one example of the kind of coalition that we need to build. That example can be repeated and needs to be repeated 100 to 1,000 times across this country, if we really are going to put job security front and centre on the political and economic agenda, and if we are really going to build unity in the trade union movement, so that our unions do not undercut each other in a bidding war such as the one that took place in the downtown office towers. The Workers' Economic Agenda gives us the tools to do just that, and I am sure that my Union, like every other union here, is committed to go out and build that.

MR. G. DOCQUIER (National Director, Steelworkers): I urge support of this paper, which is an extension of the very important document adopted yesterday on trade and deregulation. It is absolutely needed because full employment must be an all-consuming aim of our movement. It is the centrepiece of our struggle for a progressive social and equality policy.

I want to focus on one particular aspect of this statement, which underlines the twisted priorities of the Conservative managers of our economy. Our paper states that every government policy must be tested against its impact on jobs, income security and equality. Let me talk briefly on one major policy change that flies in the face of this principle that we are establishing, which holds in real contempt Wilson's and Mulroney's attitude of what is right. When they changed the unemployment insurance regulation to include pension and severance pay benefits in the calculation of earnings, overnight they changed a major policy of unemployment insurance. It is a change that destroyed immediately and irremediably, in a catastrophic way, the benefits that our people have bargained for, for months and months, in their local unions.

One good example of that is what happened with our Sudbury workers and INCO. For months, they had tried to bargain a fair retirement program and, with these changes, which came suddenly and abruptly, young people were denied the right to have a job, and older people were denied the right to retire with a decent benefit. That is the kind of policy that is totally absurd and contrary to justice and fairness.

Mulroney and Wilson do not understand these problems; as far as Mulroney and his lack of understanding are concerned, just ask our people in Shefferville about the way they were treated. They are still fighting today to get what the then Opposition Leader promised them, i.e. not to hurt them when he became Prime Minister of this country.

I urge the delegates to support this paper, and we should go out of here, and repeat over and over again what our aims are, and fight for a policy that is just, fair and equitable.

MS. F. SOBODA (Steelworkers): This document is absolutely excellent. All of the things that we heard, as we travelled this country from coast to coast talking to people about what they thought ought to be done with unemployment insurance, are in this document. Canadians want jobs, and they want jobs that provide decent wages under safe conditions, and which provide a life with dignity and meaning. They do not want part-time jobs that lead to full-time poverty in which the majority of the people involved are women.

I know whereof I speak. I stood on this platform two years ago, and told you that we had a 50 per cent rate of unemployment in Pictou county where I live and that my plant had gone from 2,300 people to about 500; well, it has now gone from 2,300 to 23 people with no hope of orders, and no hope of work in a community that now has a 58 per cent rate of unemployment. In Atlantic Canada — and I suggest in parts of the North

and in B.C., as well — we have never had anything better than a recession. For us, good times are a recession, and ordinary times are a depression.

Then, you have people who talk about the 10-week syndrome, who criticize people and say: "You only work for 10 weeks, so that you can go on unemployment insurance." That is an insult to our members and to the working people who scratch and do everything they know how to do in order to get 10 weeks' work. Then, you have your blue suit mafia telling them that they are just a bunch of lazy people who only want to work for ten weeks. That is an insult, and we should tell people that.

Working people in Canada, as well as all of us in this room, have our Ph.D.s in reality which far outweigh any other type of Ph.D. that people can talk about. That point was illustrated by the eloquent presentations made to our Commission by many of the people who are here present in this room today. They do not need doctorates to talk about what is wrong with Canada, nor do they need degrees to talk about the solutions that can be used to produce economic stimulation in order to provide jobs for the people of Canada.

Ten years ago, when Trudeau sat at his rosewood table in Ottawa and decided to demoralize the working people of Canada by fighting inflation, he cut wages and jobs and created unemployment; the working people of Canada fought back then, and we can still fight back. When Mulroney campaigned for several years on "jobs, jobs, jobs," the people of Canada wanted to believe him, but all he has created are jobs for his people, for his blue suit mafia; that is it. Now, the people of Canada recognize the truth. We have the power to change that government which has deliberately misled the people of Canada, and is continuing to do so. It is a government that tries to disguise the fact by using fancy words and very obscure texts, and when they talk about cutting jobs, their main agenda is to cut social programs. When they say that free trade is going to displace 988,000 workers in Canada, what do you think "displace" means? It means to displace jobs from Canada to the U.S.

All of the needed tools are in this document, right in our hands; the only thing missing is us, and the action that we can take. We can do it. I urge you to take this document home to your local unions, to your labour councils, to your communities and talk about it, spread it around, and organize those coalitions. Let us go out of here united to solve this problem.

MR. A. KUBE (President, BCFL): Document 18 puts forward the need for a workers' community alternative to the present economic direction. It also places human needs directly in the centre of the scheme of things. There are solutions mentioned in this document which have to be brought about by political action, and I presume Ed Broadbent will tell us about that very shortly, but there are also other things which we, as trade unionists, can accomplish. I want to address myself especially to the issue of getting control over the pension funds of workers and also the emphasis on local economic development.

There are extremely few local unions who have negotiated the ability to control the pension funds of their membership. That is really where the future lies if we are talking about democratizing capital, if you want to move capital into areas where it really meets human needs instead of corporate priorities. We have a situation, for instance, right now where a large number of unions are still letting the retained earnings of workers be administered by companies like London Life which founded, for instance, that famous organization, the National Citizens' Coalition. We have insurance company after insurance company administering virtually billions and billions of dollars of the retained earnings of our members, and we sit and let that go by. We should make it a priority in collective bargaining, to gain control over pension funds so as to ensure that these pension funds are used for the purpose of creating employment solely in this country and not anywhere else.

We also have to go into local economic development. Indeed, full employment is a very beautiful thing, but if we cannot have full employment in yesterday's terms, we shall have to talk about small economic development. We might have to find out that small can be beautiful; however, we have to make absolutely sure that small is not exploited, and that people are not exploited.

The same thing applies to the question of co-operatives. I am in favour of workers' co-operatives, but let us never forget that there are many instances where workers' co-operatives have been set up, not for the purpose of democratizing capital and giving workers meaningful controls, but merely set up by corporate interests or governments, for the purpose of undermining established union wages and benefits. We have to guard against that happening, so therefore, I am extremely pleased that we have included the proposition of unionized workers' co-operatives.

MR. R. MANN (Hamilton and District L.C.): We, in Hamilton, have a long history of working with coalitions. It is to the credit of this Congress that it sees fit to enter into such coalitions, wherever necessary, in order to fight against the big monopolies and their decision-makers who just happen to be the government of this country at the present time. It says very much for the Congress that they are reaching out and looking for other organizations that can help us in our very important campaign to create jobs and decent working conditions for all people in this country.

What is required is an outreach program — contacting these other groups — very much like what we have done in our own community. We have to build and work hard, and leadership that gets elected this week has their work cut out for them. They know what they have to get out there and do; I wish them well.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We have gone around the microphones two or three times now and I would like to test the house as to whether the question should be put. All those in favour of the question being put, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

I shall now put the question. All those in favour of document no. 18, "Full Employment and Fairness — The Workers' Agenda for Canada", please signify. Opposed. Adopted unanimously.

Would the Political Education Committee come up to the podium in order to be ready for the work that they have to do immediately following our guest speaker.

NDP guests

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I would now also like to introduce some guests who are here with us today: Howard Pawley, Premier of Manitoba; Rod Murphy, the MP for Churchill; Cyril Keeper, MP for Winnipeg North; Dan Heap, MP For Spadina; and Les Benjamin, MP for Regina. Ed Broadbent, the federal leader of the New Democratic Party is also here with us.

I would ask Brother Jack Munro to come forward.

MR. J. MUNRO (President, IWA Region One): It is certainly a great honour for me to introduce our next speaker to this Convention. From the first day that Ed became a Member of Parliament for Oshawa, he has been a leading spokesman for workers, both organized and unorganized. He has represented the old, the poor, the unemployed and anyone else who needs a voice in the House of Parliament.

When Ed assumed the official leadership of the federal New Democratic Party, he quickly became the most popular federal leader of any party in the federal government by carrying on the traditional fights of Tommy Douglas and David Lewis. He has been constantly changing in an innovative way to continue the fight for those oppressed groups which I mentioned earlier. Ed has proven himself a truly great leader, and a truly great friend of the trade union movement.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I introduce to this Convention the real leader of the Opposition, the best leader in the House of Commons, Brother Ed Broadbent.

ADDRESS BY ED BROADBENT
Federal Leader of the New Democratic Party

MR. E. BROADBENT (Leader, New Democratic Party): It is a pleasure to be here with you. I have said, on similar occasions in the past, that there are a number of political leaders, members of parliament, and members of provincial legislatures in the country, who do not like to participate in trade union gatherings. But I want you to know that there are two groups that I feel immensely close to as a Canadian. One is the New Democratic Party of Canada; the other is the group that works day in and day out for men and women inside and outside the trade union movement for social causes at home and just causes abroad, i.e. the trade union movement. I am delighted to be here with you.

Whether in the workplace, on the picket line or in the House of Commons, trade union members, men and women, and New Democrats, have worked together to build a just and more compassionate nation. We have been, we are and we will remain partners in the quest for a social democratic Canada here at home and a peaceful international community abroad. Just think of some recent examples where we have been together. On Sunday, in Vancouver, members of the New Democratic Party and the trade union movement marched together for peace. A month ago, textile workers — mainly women — concerned about their loss of jobs in Montreal, met with New Democratic MPs, to see what could be done about it. Just a few weeks ago, in Newfoundland, in the face of vicious anti-union legislation — condemned by the International Labour Organization — brought in by the Conservatives in that province, while the Liberals went into hiding, our provincial leader joined with the Newfoundland Federation of Labour and the people of Newfoundland, and forced Premier Peckford to back down.

I am pleased to tell you that Canadians, wherever they may live right now, are responding as never before to the claims of fairness and social justice made by the New Democratic Party.

Statistically speaking — and I do not intend to indulge in many statistics in this speech — we have just come through the best twelve-month period in terms of popular support in the history of the New Democratic Party. In survey after survey, in all four provinces in Western Canada, at the federal level, the New Democratic Party is now either first or second. In the Province of Ontario, we have only one seat fewer than the Liberals in the House of Commons. The polls show that in Atlantic Canada we are also at the highest point ever. I want to add now, as an English-speaking Canadian who did not grow up in Quebec, perhaps what has given me the most pleasure is the reality that, for the first time in the history of our country, month after month now, one out of four Quebecers indicate that they plan to vote for the NDP in the next federal election.

Our numerous visits in Chicoutimi, Sherbrooke, Montréal, Jonquières, Windsor, Saint-Jean, Québec, and Shawinigan are starting to bear fruit. Over the last six months, support in Quebec has reached an historical high. In the House of Commons, while Brian Mulroney is breaking every promise he made, be it about equality for women, taxation or the universality of social programs, and while the Liberals are talking on both sides of their mouths at the same time, the NDP remains faithful to its commitment to fight on behalf of the citizens of Canada.

Instead of keeping this promise to bring greater equity to Canadian man and women, Brian Mulroney is doing exactly the opposite. He is holding out his hand to his favourite cousin, Ronald Reagan. It is not by accident that the two men are talking about privatization and deregulation. It is not by accident that they consider these two issues as having a logical connection with free trade.

Behind the smiles and the fine words, Reagan and Mulroney firmly believe in a more flexible market economy. They want to reverse the course of our history and that of the United States, and each of them gives priority to the interests of the market, rather than to those of the nation. Such an approach is a triumph of conservative ideology over common sense and national mutual aid. Instead of bringing concrete and effective solutions to the need for new jobs, instead of providing Canadian men and women with more equity, Brian Mulroney is blindly following in Ronald Reagan's footsteps.

There is no mistake about it. While fighting for jobs in the Kootenays, in the east of Montreal, in Moncton, we must at the same time fight against this ideology. There is no mistake about it. In fighting for jobs for men and women, both of the public and private sectors, we must at the same time fight against deregulation, privatization and free trade.

There should be no misunderstanding about the Conservative agenda in Canada; it is inextricably linked with the conservative agenda of the United States of America. It is not an accident that, in both countries right now, we have been going together toward privatization, deregulation and, from the leadership of both, movements for free trade. They are connected.

Consider first deregulation: in that context, no one — not the New Democratic Party, the trade union movement, farming communities — no one in this country wants regulations for their own sake; that is simply stupid. We want regulations for safe food, safe transportation and good service for our people. Deregulation for its own sake threatens the jobs of communication workers, transportation workers and health inspectors. Deregulation also means more breakdowns, more accidents for passengers, and reduced services for people in many parts of Canada. I want to say to you very clearly that this move by the Conservatives for deregulation for its own sake and principle makes no sense. Instead of blindly following in Reagan's footsteps, Brian Mulroney should have benefited from the American experience with deregulation, instead of following, just for once, Brian Mulroney ought to have shown a little leadership here in Canada.

Consider also privatization: once again, Brian Mulroney is following his buddy, Ronald Reagan. He has caught what can only be described as the privatization disease. Ronald Reagan and his corporate friends look at the scale of public sector involvement in the Canadian economy with horror. His buddies in the drug industry in the U.S. do not like our public policy on generic drugs which we use here to keep our drug prices down. They have complained vigorously and, as a result, Brian Mulroney now plans, probably later this week or next, to introduce legislation that will give the American drug companies what they want.

Petro-Canada is not only a publicly-owned petroleum company, it was also supposed to be set up to keep prices down. Once again the old industry in our own country, the multinationals located here and American pressure from the United States said that this had to be changed. Pat Carney promptly wrote a letter to Petro-Canada, just after the last election, and told them that they had to perform and act in the marketplace just like Imperial Oil and Shell, i.e. they had to become profit-maximizers.

Certain United States interests say that our unemployment insurance benefits are too rich for everyone, including our fishermen. These regulations too, according to them, must go.

On all fronts, Mulroney and his supine cabinet move to comply with the American pressures. Privatization is viewed by the U.S. Republicans — not necessarily by the American citizens on the whole — as essential, even if it means that the poor become poorer and go hungry, as is happening in the United States, and even if it means that the homeless must, in increasing numbers, sleep in the streets, as they are now doing.

We have already seen the trend to privatization in Canada with the contracting-out of more public service jobs to the private sector, with the destruction of Petro Canada's original purpose, and with Mulroney's determination to sell off our aerospace industry as fast as he can. He started out, as you well know, with the De Havilland Corporation.

As one Canadian citizen who believes strongly that I speak for a majority on this kind of issue, I want to say to Brian Mulroney right now that Canadians have established a different tradition of public service and public ownership in our country and in our mixed economy. We have travelled a different route from our American cousins, and we are proud of our medicare and our pension schemes and our unemployment insurance. We like our public sector and we plan to keep these traditions, and, whether Ronald Reagan likes it or not, we are going to keep them indefinitely into the future.

Consider now free trade; I know that you have talked about it, and I have seen the resolutions that you have supported, and it will not surprise you to know that you have my strongest support. But I do want to put it in the context of what my party believes in, in regard to the present and future of our nation. It is simply going too far to go down this route. Jobs are at stake, and that fact is profoundly important, but the very future or our nation is also at stake. We know that trade as such is essential for economic growth.

Canadians understand very well the mutual inter-dependence of our two economies. Canada and the United States are, to quote a cliche so often repeated, "the largest bilateral trading partners in the world", and they will also certainly and desirably remain so in the future. The flow of goods and services between us is already among the most unrestricted on this globe, so fighting free trade with the U.S. is neither anti-trade nor anti-American. For us to put it very bluntly and totally accurately, it simply means fighting for our nation and our jobs.

Ever since the Conservatives first started talking about free trade, poll after poll has shown declining public support among Canadian men and women. This is no accident. The more information Canadians have, the more they are opposed to free trade. Members of the International Woodworkers of America know that, despite beating the United States hands down on competition in soft wood, they are still threatened today with countervailing action by Washington. Farmers know that free trade would mean the loss of their marketing boards, which is serious right across the Prairies and in every other farming region in Canada. Women in our textile industries know that their markets would be flooded, and Canadians, wherever they live, and whatever their occupation may be, know that medicare and pensions ought to remain here, and should never be challenged by the United States or by anyone else, as a form of unfair subsidy.

As for those hundreds of thousands of men and women working in multinational subsidiaries here in Canada, they know that, no matter how you slice it, free trade would mean the freedom of corporations to move jobs out of Canada, while retaining their complete freedom to sell into the Canadian market. That is what it is all about. If increased profits could be made by such action, firms with headquarters in New York, Detroit and Chicago would, obviously, decide to move those jobs elsewhere. The stark reality is that the United States has firms already established in a market ten times more powerful than ours, and it does not take a genius to understand that, for two companies, otherwise equally competitive — one Canadian and one American — in a new free trade arrangement, the one with an established market ten times greater than the other has an immense economic advantage. It is an advantage which I do not want to give to the United States over our own workers, and Mulroney must understand that.

Brian Mulroney, himself, said in 1983: "Free trade affects sovereignty and we will have none of it". When he said it in 1983, he was right then, because it was true then, and it is still true now in 1986. As I indicated earlier, the record of this government is dangerous, not only for the present, but for the future of Canada. I have already mentioned a number of points that they have caved in on. They also have killed the Foreign Investment Review Agency; they have destroyed the good parts of the National Energy Program; they have allowed Prentice Hall Canada to remain under American ownership, all in direct response to United States pressure.

Not only has Brian Mulroney agreed to put the interests of all Canadians on the negotiating table — and he has done that — he has, believe it or not, just celebrated the United States Senate's Fast Track decision as a victory. Nothing could be further from the truth. The United States' senators, I regret to say, have won hands down. Not only have they got assurances from Reagan that he will take steps now against our soft wood exports, but they also retain their constitutional rights and power, now and forever, to take countervailing action against any Canadian export from any sector of our economy. All Canadian interests are up for grabs, but this crucial United States's Senate power will remain untouched. They are delighted with the decision. The senators are virtually ecstatic. Heads they win; tails we lose. No wonder they agreed to the Fast Track.

Brian Mulroney, who began this process at a time when we had a $20 billion surplus in trade and has gone downhill ever since, simply cannot be relied upon. He says to us, not only to you as men and women in the trade union movement, nor to me as leader of the New Democratic Party, but he says to all Canadians: "Just trust me". We have heard that before, and I say to him: "We are not prepared to trust you. We have seen that record since September 1984, and we do not like what we see. We want no more concessions, no abandonment of our farmers, no sacrifice in our exports, no sell-out to women workers in the textile sector, no concessions on drug prices, and no abandonment of the auto pact." We say, in short, on this profoundly important historical question, to Brian Mulroney: "We want you, just for once, to say no to the United States and yes for Canada." That is what he should do.

My friends, I want to conclude with this observation. As a guy who has turned that magic age of 50, it means that I am not too young to have some ideas and not too old to have lost them maybe. I am a guy who has had it pretty good, growing up in this country of ours. I am very moved about my country, because my generation has had a great opportunity, and I want to say that we want to build on our ancestors' foundation, enshrining two official languages, pursuing a different democratic tradition, and creating unique cultural and social institutions.

Ours is a great nation, not because of power, but because we have made great strides in combining decency with creativity, and liberty with equality. We are second to none among the nations of the world, and we have much more to do, but we need a nation to do it. It is our obligation to safeguard and enhance, not destroy Canadian independence. It its our challenge to make sure that our nation's potential becomes its reality, and it is our children's right to inherit a Canada run by Canadians. We must never let them down.

(Standing ovation)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Munro): Ed, certainly, the delegates have expressed their feelings, and I want to say that, coming from a Convention whose theme is unity, we, as Canadians, for two or three days last week, were insulted by the open defiance of common decency to the Canadian people when our Prime Minister celebrated a tie vote by 20 United States senators: thank goodness, you were on our side.

I would like to call on Sister Carr to pay a tribute to Tommy Douglas.

TRIBUTE TO TOMMY DOUGLAS

MS. S. CARR (Secretary-Treasurer, CLC): Tommy Douglas was a very, very, special person. Everybody who had the privilege of meeting him, or ever hearing him speak, knew that he was a person who cared, not only about socialist causes in the abstract, but even more about the people who, in their daily

lives, stood to benefit from socialist programs. Today, we do not so much mourn his death as we celebrate his life. We also want to say a special "thank you" to Irma, his wife, and their two daughters, Shirley and Joan, who shared his times with us.

Tommy's career in politics was a long and active one. He was a CCF candidate in 1934, elected in 1935 and was still a serving NDP Member of Parliament up to 1979 when he retired. In June 1944, Tommy was elected Premier of the first socialist government in North America. Though opposed by the banks, the corporations, the media and the federal Liberal government, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, under Tommy, gave Saskatchewan the first health and hospital plans in Canada, the first public auto insurance in the world, and good labour legislation, including collective bargaining rights for provincial employees.

When the labour movement decided to join with the CCF and other groups to form the New Democratic Party in 1961, it was to Tommy that we turned for leadership. His tireless work and good humour helped establish the base for our party. Though he never achieved power federally, the effect of his campaigning was seen in the establishment of a national medicare plan, the Canada pension plan, collective bargaining for public employees and ridding Canada of nuclear weapons. When Tommy stepped down as leader, he remained a constant critic of government wrongdoing — most notably in 1970, when the War Measures Act was used — and an advocate of progressive reform, such as the setting up of a national oil company.

Tommy's plea had been to Canadians: "Give us 70 seats, and we will turn Parliament upside down; give us 170 seats, and we will turn Canada right side up." That was his plea and his message to us. Our tribute to Tommy should not only be to protect the programs he helped to enact, but to give his party, the New Democrats, the chance to turn Canada right side up. What that right side is was expressed by Tommy, himself, in 1945, in words that are just as appropriate today:

"Surely, if we can produce in such abundance in order to destroy our enemies, we can produce in equal abundance in order to provide food, clothing and shelter for our children. If we can keep people employed for the purpose of destroying human life, surely we can keep them employed for the purpose of enriching and enhancing human life."

For your efforts in achieving this goal, we say, Thanks, Tommy, we miss you.

POLITICAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

MR. W. PARSONS (Political Education Committee Chairperson): The Political Education Committee's report is contained in document no. 12.

MS. N. RICHE (Political Education Committee Secretary): The first resolution in document 12 covers Political Education resolutions no. 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6:

"WHEREAS the Canadian labour movement played a central role in the creation of the New Democratic Party 25 years ago; and

"WHEREAS the NDP led by Ed Broadbent has spoken up for the concerns and interests of the average Canadian worker when they are under by business or conservative governments;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the working people reaffirm their support for the party that has supported them; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress put into effect labour schools or seminars to educate our brothers and sisters on what the NDP is about and what it has done for our country and for working people; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in co-operation with its affiliates who are legally free to do so, the CLC undertake a campaign to increase local union affiliations to the New Democratic Party, thereby giving more trade unionists direct access the decision and policy-making structures of the party, and also providing a more secure and democratic financial base for labour's party; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that February 1987 be designated as affiliation month during which time unions who are legally free to do so will seek to increase the number of their local affiliated to the NDP; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that every member of the local union leadership be mailed information on how and why to join the NDP as an individual member."

I move concurrence; seconded by another member of the Committee.

MR. P. MOIST (CUPE): I am particularly proud to say that I come from the Province of Manitoba. Since 1969, except for four years between 1977 and 1981, we have had an NDP government. We had Manitoba's version of Bill Bennett, Sterling Lyon, and, for the first time, in the 115 years of our province's existence, an administration was voted out after one term because Manitobans said "no". In 1981, we brought the Howard Pawley NDP government into power and, six weeks ago, we continued the tradition that began in the late '60s, continued into the early '70s, and throughout the '80s, i.e. we have re-elected the NDP to take us into the 1990s.

Those are the electoral facts, but the real question is: Why does the Federation of Labour, and why do the working people of Manitoba continue to elect Canada's only, at the present time, social democratic government?

Here are a few more facts that perhaps the delegates here will understand: compulsory first contract legislation introduced in 1982; expedited arbitration procedure introduced in 1982; funding for our Manitoba Federation of Labour's Occupational Health Clinic through the Health Services Commission of the Province of Manitoba; funding of the Manitoba Labour Education Centre by the Province of Manitoba; pay equity extended in the public sector with target dates and money set aside to implement that pay equity, and a commitment in the next term to introduce it into the private sector; the highest minimum wage in Canada.

The Pawley government, as well, is assisting the labour movement in our province with the charter cases that we are facing right now, because they are not only attacking labour, they are attacking our government and our government's legislation, which was put in on our behalf. Our government is an intervenor into those proceedings, and is sharing the burden and the enormous cost of beating back the employers in the courtroom.

This resolution seeks to extend the type of relationship we have enjoyed in Manitoba, throughout this country. Workers do not just support the NDP in Manitoba, we are part of the NDP government. I am proud to say that, in the recently announced Cabinet, our new Minister of Finance, first elected in 1981, comes out of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, and our New Minister of Urban Affairs comes out of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association.

We do not believe that Bay Street or the law schools, or the Chambers of Commerce or the business community produce the best politicians. We think working people have a lot to offer the political process, and we are practising that in Manitoba right now.

It is not always easy to get along with a friendly government. Sometimes, it is more difficult, I realize as one who has to partake in the process of presenting Manitoba Federation of Labour briefs. However, I would rather present a brief to a friendly government any day of the week. We are proud of our achievements in Manitoba. I was very proud that Premier Pawley was introduced here today. Where else in the country would you have a Premier who is not afraid to actively meet with labour on

a regular basis and to come to our union centre? It does not happen in Newfoundland and I doubt that it is happening in B.C., Saskatchewan, Alberta, the Maritimes, Quebec or Ontario. In Manitoba, we have a government that we, in labour, feel full partners with. I urge everybody to look towards, and work towards February 1987, because it is never enough. We need more members in the party, and we have to get them one door-step at a time. We need to deliver labour conditions throughout the country, and we need more governments that care about people, and less governments that care about business.

MR. G. MICHAUD (UAW, Canada): We are spending a lot of time at this Convention discussing many things affecting Canadian workers which are brought about by the callous disregard by the federal government for the rights of those workers and their families. Les us examine some of the things we are discussing: We are talking about free trade, and the subsequent erosion of jobs that will result. We are talking about things that affect the economy such as the lack of Canadian content, which is causing horrendous problems in the auto industry. Look at what is happening with unemployment insurance where the federal government has effectively removed, in Ontario, the plant closure separation pay that we had won for workers after a long, hard struggle. Our pensioners, who retired early and thought they would have a year to step down on their wages, have found, all of a sudden, that all of those pensions are considered as earnings for unemployment insurance purposes.

The things happening now cannot be addressed at the bargaining table, they have to be addressed through political action. Not so long ago, one of our pensioners came into the union office, and he received a great shock when he found out that the $276 which he had expected to draw from the unemployment insurance benefit for the next 50 weeks, was suddenly reduced to $68, because his pension was now considered as earnings. After he had finished expounding, I said: "This is your gift from the Brian Mulroney government, but of course, I am sure that none of our pensioners voted Conservative." And he said, "Well, had I known what they were going to do, I would not have voted for them."

That is the whole problem. We have to educate people to the fact that we cannot do anything in this country unless we have a government that is responsive to the needs of workers. Certainly, we have not yet seen that happen in Ontario, nor have we seen it federally. For that to happen, we have to get some votes, and, obviously, we do not control the votes of our members: if we did, we would have elected a federal government of workers a long time ago.

We have to do two things. We have to educate people so that their affiliations lie with a party like the NDP whose interests are with the workers and not the corporations of this world or the Ronald Reagans of this world. We have to do another thing: we have to raise money, because you cannot run an election cheaply. It takes a great deal of money to put the kinds of campaigns that we have to have in order to elect a government. You cannot come to a convention like this and discuss all the problems that we have in this country with workers, and the things that are besetting workers, and then walk away, having paid your lip service; that is not the end of it.

The struggle goes on, on a day-to-day basis and, in order to achieve a victory in that struggle, you have to go back to your local unions, and you have to put Political Education Committees into place who will explain to the workers why it is in their interest to elect a New Democratic government. The other thing that you have to do is convince your officers and then your membership that we need money, and one of the best places of getting money is through affiliation with the New Democratic Party. Many locals in this country, across the provinces and the territories, do exactly that; but many, unfortunately the majority, do not.

I do not see how any worker or representative of workers, particularly, cannot be a democratic socialist. You just have to look at the history of this country to see what the Liberals and Conservatives have done. When you get doublecrossed so many times, surely you have to think about doing something. I would urge you to go back to your local unions, set up those Political Education Committees, discuss with your membership why they should be affiliating, and then do it, please.

MR. J. CALLAGHAN (CBRT & GW): We have been debating questions here for the last two days which, fundamentally, are political. There is only one solution to those questions and it is political. There is only one party that supports our position on these political questions and it is the New Democratic Party of this country. I find it strange, indeed, that we come and talk, convention after convention, about what we should be doing on the political front. Yet, when the election rolls around in every jurisdiction, with the exception of Manitoba, we elect the enemies of labour. Why is this happening? it is happening because we are not getting the message across even to our own members and their wives and their families. We must now address this question, and address it urgently.

The NDP is the only party that will take a stand publicly on the issues that are in the interests of the people we represent. In Quebec, in 1970, when the government imposed a fascist law upon us, the only party that stood up in the House of Commons and condemned it was the New Democratic Party, not the Liberals not the Tories.

MR. J. RUSHTON (UFAWU): We set yesterday and earlier today quite a massive task for our movement, which will require the leadership of each and every active trade unionist across this country. We have set a course that is going to require a massive change in the voting patterns and the thinking of many, many Canadians.

We have a trade union movement that is capable of turning this country around. We have a big task that should go on continuously. When we talk about electing the New Democratic Party across the country, we have different circumstances. We have to work and fight with all the sections of our community on all issues, just like what happened on the pensioners' issue. We can change the policies of our government. We change governments and we can take people into the streets with the idea of acting in your interest to build a political movement that will defeat the Tories and elect a progressive government.

MR. D. CROOK (PSAC-NTPSA): I rise against the motion. We have to look at it another way as well. I support everything Mr. Broadbent said today. When it comes to labour, his is the only party that represents us. But als long as a party is running for, and on the platform of liberalized abortion laws, we, in the labour movement cannot stand there and say: "You have our support carte blanche."

I urge you to take one more look. It is more than just labour, it is our unborn children's rights, too.

MR. P. FORDER (UAW, Canada): All of us who are active in this party and this labour movement monitor what other people, outside of our families, are saying about us. This morning, on the CBC we had Dalton Camp talking about the Canadian Labour Congress, with Dave Barrett and Eric Kierans. They were talking about the labour movement and where it is going with its new leadership, with its new focus on issues of the day that are impacting on working people. it was very interesting that Dalton Camp said that he thought the labour movement was making a mistake because it was becoming too political. Dalton Camp says that we should not be involved in those issues, and we should not be tying ourselves in with the New Democratic Party. I find it curious that he is the same kind of person, it is the same kind of party that would very much like to see the Merv Lavigne case proceed, so that we could not participate in the political life of our country.

Mr. Lavigne is a twice-defeated Liberal candidate, who is costing the labour movement $500,000 of our dues payers' dollars to try to defend ourselves in order to be able to stand up for the issues that are important to working people. The Dalton Camps and the Merv Lavignes are the same people who are against us for fighting for nuclear peace and disarmament in the world, the same people who do not want us to have pay equity for women in our country, the same people who oppose choice, and the same people who do not want to clean up the environment. We have to realize that they are the same kind of people like Mr. Reagan and his ilk, who have systematically weakened the trade union movement in the United States.

In 1975, 29 per cent of the work force in the United States were members of unions. Today, that figure is less than 19 per cent, thanks to the Reagans of the world. They know that, if they can weaken the labour movement, they can prevent a strident fight on behalf of the ordinary person in this country. We, in this labour body, have to come of age. We talk about peace and unity, but we should be talking about peace, unity and jobs, in a very thoughtful and careful way. We want to have the party, as Ed Broadbent so eloquently laid out this morning, defend our rights to prevent our society from being deregulated.

We want to ensure that privatization does not come about so it can slaughter the public sector. We want to ensure that there are not cutbacks, through contracting-out, of the jobs that we fought so hard to organize in the public sector, in particular. We want to ensure that the unemployment insurance benefits will be in place when they are needed. And we want to ensure that the Camps and those people on the right in this society, who have no economic vision of how to solve the problems plaguing working people, do not impose their will and tell trade union people at this Convention, or the members we represent, who they should be working for. It seems to be clear that Mr. Mulroney has failed miserably in any attempt whatsoever to solve the many problems that plague workers.

I do not have to tell you here that we talked about issues of concern to our membership on this floor. And I say to all people, on the right, on the left and the centre of this Congress, that we have to harness the compassion, the energy, and the necessary commitment to pull out act together politically, so that our enemies will not be able to pick us off in isolation. I heard Jean-Claude Parrot, yesterday, say that he is going to work with the private sector and fight free trade, and that he is going to work to make sure his membership understand the issues, and all of the things concerning free trade and the sell-out of this country to the United States. If we can get the public sector and the private sector to work hand in hand and believe that we can do it in a spirit of co-operation, to support a party that never fails to support our interests, then we will begin to start to build the kind of society that all of us want so desperately to come about. Let us support Broadbent, let us affiliate to the party and let us get the job done, once and for all.

MR. B. WEISLEDER (NUPEG-OPSEU): It has been said many times before that labour needs political action because without political action we enter into collective bargaining with one hand tied behind our backs. It is like navigating a dangerous waterway without a compass, without a view of our long-term needs and interests. Big business has plenty of political action. They own and control at least two major political parties, and, at the provincial level, others besides. Through these parties, they dictate their political, economic and social will to us, the majority, the working people in this country. So, for political action, truly we need political education, and for that reason, we should support the proposals of the committee's report.

But political action must be a two-way street between the labour movement and the New Democratic Party. We need a stronger presence of the labour movement in the New Democratic Party because that will help make that party more accountable to working people. In supporting this resolution we are not blind to the fact that NDP governments have broken strikes, and, that they have legislated wage controls on working people, so we are aware of the need for accountability and for a workers' agenda to be uppermost in the mind of any NDP government at any level. To have that accountability and commitment of the NDP to labour's agenda, and to the socialist policies that will advance the interest of working people in this country, we need to affiliate.

We need to attend gatherings of the NDP, and to fill the halls of NDP Conventions with trade union delegates. We need to provide labour movement candidates who are prepared to run on the NDP level. We do not need doctors, lawyers, accountants and professors to speak for working people. We are better qualified to speak for our own interests, and we have a vehicle by which to do that, i.e. through the New Democratic Party affiliated to this labour movement. But we also need to have an expanded conception of political education and political action. Political action takes place every day of the year, not just at election time.

We are preparing through the discussions at this Congress to mobilize our ranks in political protest actions against deregulation, against privatization, against cutbacks and against anti-labour laws. We are also part of the popular movements across this country against war, against political and social injustice at home and abroad, and we have every right to expect to see the New Democratic Party mobilize its members through its riding associations, to join us in the streets, to join union picket lines and street demonstrations every day of the year. We have a message to convey to our sisters and brothers in the NDP, i.e. it is great to see the NDP speaking out in the legislatures and in the Parliament of Canada on our concerns and for our interests, but if we are to have real unity in action, we must have it inside and outside of the parliamentary framework, day in and day out. In voting for ths resolution, I hope that we do so with this thought in mind. We have to work to get more union members inside the NDP, and to get more NDP into the streets and into the campaigns of the labour movement.

MS. J. LANGAN (ITU): We sat here yesterday, and we booed Mulroney and Wilson on the video, and we stood today and gave a standing ovation to Ed Broadbent and the New Democratic Party. Most delegates here do not remember a time when Tommy Douglas, a member of my union, fought and won medicare. We do not remember a time when Stanley Knowles, also a member of my union, fought and won pensions. Most of us do not remember a time when the CCF was developed and formed, and, much less, 25 years ago, when the New Democratic Party became our new beginning in the partnership with organized labour, formed to provide a vehicle for trade unionists to ensure that we would have input in the policy development of our party.

That provision was the affiliation provision, and we have not exercised our rights under that provision. I would suggest to you that, if the New Democratic Party is not representing us in this country, maybe it is because you and I have not done enough. If the New Democratic Party is not representing you in your province, maybe it is because you and I have not done enough. If the New Democratic Party is not representing you in your riding, it may be because you and I have not done enough.

If you think it is not important, I would like to remind delegates of 1983 in B.C. when we lost the last provincial election by three per cent of the vote. That gave Bill Bennett and his Socreds the right, and in their view, a mandate to cut our labour code, to eliminate human rights, to destroy the bargaining rights of the public sector workers in B.C., to create union and non-union sites at Expo, to dismantle our education system, to cripple the health care system, to throw seniors on the streets to make room for visitors to Expo.

If we do not win the next provincial election in B.C., next time you come across the Rockies to visit us, stop and read the

sign which will say "Welcome to British Columbia, the first right-to-work province in Canada". I urge you to affiliate your union if your Constitution allows it. Think about it. If we were all doing our part in our party, we would not only be the government of Manitoba, and the government of Yukon, but we would get the government in Alberta, and reclaim the governments in Saskatchewan and B.C., and we would be the government in Canada.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Munro): I want to test the house: Those in favour of the question, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

Those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MR. W. PARSONS (Political Education Committee Chairman): Some people referred to Manitoba as having the only NDP government, but I would like to remind the delegates that the great territory up North called the Yukon has an NDP government under Tony Penikett, a former Steelworker.

MS. N. RICHE (Political Education Committee Secretary): Resolution PE-3 as amended:

"WHEREAS in 1982 the Ontario Federation of Labour decided to make municipal politics a priority; and

"WHEREAS the New Democratic Party needs the involvement of labour municipal campaigns; and

"WHEREAS the NDP has been increasing their popular support every year;

"BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC work with federations of labour to encourage local unions and labour councils to become more involved in municipal elections; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC, in conjunction with the NDP, assist federations to sponsor schools for municipal politics and campaign managers on a province-wide basis".

I move concurrence; seconded by W. Parsons.

MR. M. LYONS (President, Metro Toronto LC): If we are going to succeed with our political agenda, then the labour movement will have to get active at all three political levels; federal, provincial and municipal. We have done well in the NDP, and we shall do better at both the federal and provincial levels. For too long, we have overlooked the importance of municipal politics. One of the most important things that we, as workers, can get out of municipal politics is jobs. We should be getting down to those municipal councils and making sure that they are, in fact, living up to their responsibility to create jobs, the most important need in our country today.

The fact of the matter is that municipal governments can have a very significant impact on the quality of life for all workers. Municipal governments in this country spend 25 per cent more than the federal government. In this city, where we are meeting today, municipal governments, each year, spend more than $5 billion. The trade union movement should be working to elect people who are going to use these funds in the best interests of working people.

Some of the ways in which they can do just that are sane purchasing policies and buy-union purchasing policies. We had an NDP government here in this city at the Board of Education, the first government that I know of in Canada to adopt a buy-union policy. I am sorry to report that, at the last municipal election, we lost two seats; as a result, the Liberals and Tories who now control that Board have done away with the buy-union policy and that has cost our members about $10 million worth of jobs.

Municipal governments can be effective in housing. In our city, it is sad to report again that, over this past winter, we actually had people die because they did not have adequate housing that is a shame that should never, never be repeated. Municipal governments can be involved in housing as well, and it is our responsibility to get down there and make sure that they are. We have municipal housing corporations here that can provide the funds to create the jobs to build the homes, so that we need not have those deaths anymore. Municipal governments can ensure that we do not lose our manufacturing base and the well-paying jobs that go with it. We have to protect those jobs; we can do it if we get active at the municipal levels, and demand that manufacturing remain an important aspect of every single municipality. Municipalities can provide those same kinds of important social services we shall be talking about in a few days. Municipalities can provide day care, they can provide child care, they can help provide services for battered women; and we had better be down there as trade unionists making sure that they do that.

What about health services and health care? We, in the labour movement, fight day-in-day-out for safe work places; we led the fight for occupational health and safety. But what sense does it make to clean up the workplace if we have those same employers dumping their poison into their sewers and into our rivers. We can do something about that too.

Municipal taxes are a vital issue. We are having the same problems at the municipal level that we are having at the federal level. We have municipal governments that are giving tax breaks and tax benefits to the corporations and nothing for working people. The proposition has shifted municipally as it has federally and provincially, and working people are required to pay more and more in municipal taxes, while corporations and businesses are paying less and less. Again, we can do something to stop that if we get involved in municipal politics.

I hope that this resolution will be adopted unanimously, but more than that, I hope that we will take it to heart and get active in municipal politics. If we do, then I have no doubt that we shall see some tremendous benefits coming to the working people of this country, and they deserve it.

MR. B. WARD (CUC): As a recently elected member of the Brantford City Council, I cannot say enough about the benefits of the OFL's School of Municipal Elections, which helped me to plan my campaign and develop my leaflets. The labour movement needs to encourage its members to get involved in the political arena, and the CLC should be showing leadership in this area by sponsoring school for municipal politics across Canada, not just in certain provinces. For too long, our cities and towns have been controlled by business people who answer to the Chamber of Commerce and not to the working people. By adopting this resolution, the CLC will confirm that the labour movement is prepared to stand behind its members who are willing to take on the business people at the municipal level, and supply the help that is necessary for us to gain victory in municipal elections.

MR. G. MICHAUD (UAW, Canada): I do have a very serious problem with what we are saying here. We have come to this Convention several years in a row, and we have discussed affiliation with the NDP. One of the reasons we do not have a government is because there are not a lot of people in this room who belong to the NDP. One of the things that we have done consistently is try to convince this Convention that people who come to CLC Convention should also be active and affiliated to their labour councils at the local level. I happen to have a great deal of difficulty with a large number of people in this room who are going to vote on this issue, and who are going to mandate labour councils to which they are not affiliated and do not belong to.

Later in this Convention, we are going to have a resolution in which the Resolutions Committee has said they are going to recommend non-concurrence. They ought to be ashamed of that recommendation, and they ought to rethink that one. If the delegates to this Convention are going to vote on this issue, and are going to put their hands up, and mandate the labour councils of

this country to do the job for them, then they had better support the other resolution when it comes up, on affiliating.

MR. D. AITKEN (Secretary-Treasurer,AFL): It is high time that we became involved officially on the municipal level. In Alberta, we have taken the example of the Toronto Labour Council who has put together some really good material on how to get involved in municipal politics. At the end of May, we shall be holding a Federation-sponsored Labour and Municipal Political Conference. It is an opportunity for us, as working people, to show that, even though in some municipalities there are no party politics, there is an opportunity for us to elect working people to represent working people. We cannot continue to elect business people or people who have an idea of what it is like in the workplace, or have no idea of what it is like to work on a minimum wage, and expect them to start working on behalf of working people. That is not the way it works.

One thing I would like to point out is that the National Political Education Committee has put together a brochure, which is in your kits, entitled: *Let's Work to Get Canada Working For Us*. I would urge each and every one of you here to read this, and to get involved with the party that is your party. It is not only your privilege to get involved, it is also your responsibility. I would urge you to get involved, and let us turn this country around.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Munro): I want to test the Convention. Are you ready for the question? The question is being called. Those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please signify. Opposed. Carried. That completes the work of the Committee.

Would the Economic Policy Committee please come up to the platform.

National Day of Mourning — Injured Workers

MS. S. CARR (CLC Secretary-Treasurer): The Municipality of Ottawa has endorsed the National Day of Mourning for workers killed or injured from on-the-job accidents or diseases; and will urge other Canadian municipalities to do so.

ECONOMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

MR. J. FRYER (Economic Policy Committee Chairperson): We now are going to deal with document 2, "Report of the Economic Policy Committee". We apologize for the fact that 20 of the Economic Policy resolutions were omitted from the French resolutions book. However, we have endeavoured to correct this omission by printing a separate supplement which lists the text of these resolutions.

The Economic Policy Committee met to consider Resolution EC-1 to EC-135 and wishes to report as follows:

An Executive Council Policy Statement entitled *Our Canada or Theirs? Workers Confront the Corporate Blueprint* has been distributed to all delegates. The Committee recommends that this statement covers the subject matter in resolutions: EC-33, EC-34, EC-43, EC-46, EC-51, EC-68, EC-69, EC-70, EC-74, EC-75, EC-83, EC-85, EC-87, EC-91-96, EC-101, EC-104, EC-108, EC-113, EC-114, EC-116, EC-117, EC-121, EC-122, EC-125, EC-126, EC-130, EC-132, EC-135.

On behalf of the Committee, I would move concurrence that the policy statement called: *Our Canada or Theirs? Workers Confront the Corporate Blueprint* be accepted to include the resolutions; seconded by R. McGarry.

MR. J. DUFF (UAW, Canada): I speak to you today on the harshest economic climate we have suffered in years, and the people whom we represent in our local are casualties of this economic crisis.

They are permanent casualties who are victims of an economic situation that sees a local that once had 5,000 members, a local that was front-page news across the city of Toronto, become a local that is no longer considered newsworthy. We are seeing ourselves in a war of attrition that will see us disappear entirely from the face of the earth by the end of this year. It is the local that pioneered many things in this nation, and, as a matter of fact, was the home local of the retiring president of this organization. Yet, despite the harsh economic climate, despite the depression in the agricultural implements industry, we have managed in the last six years to negotiate two agreements where we gave nothing away. We stood fast, and, as a matter of fact, we made some modest gains.

We have seen attrition, we have seen our people decimated we have seen a situation where people ventured into a new lexicon, i.e. the exhaustees. They are the people who exhausted their unemployment insurance. They come to us in droves. We have seen people, who had invested their lives in the community of Toronto, now uprooted and being displaced and turned away. Time and time again, we see our membership going down the drain.

At one time, when the Massey-Ferguson Corporation stood here in Toronto, we were big news, front-line news. Now, we seem to be disappearing. There has been a restructuring which was supported both federally and provincally, and on December 18, on behalf of the membership, I wrote a letter to Brian Mulroney because of our concern about the out-sourcing, another new word in our lexicon. When I was a boy, we called it sub-contracting; now, today, it is out-sourcing.

I wrote to him about the out-sourcing, about the attrition that happened to our membership, because I had seen that what was happening to us was that the government had entered into a project at the federal level supporting this Corporation, and therefore, I suppose, I laid it out that the workers deserved some support too.

Four months later, he replied to me, after I had urged him, in a second letter, in which I expressed concern about the fact that, even if he was tied up with the affairs of state, workers at least, deserved a reply. Last week, I got the most platitudinous document, full of hypocrisy and nonsense stating that, while he realized that we were caught up, initiatives took precedence, and his government had created a half million jobs. What does that nonsense mean to the members of our local union who have suffered this kind of attrition. This platitudinous document was just complete nonsense.

However, as I said, under this hard economic climate, there is no turning back for us. By this year's end, you may see us gone; where we once had 5,000 members, we are now 80 people. Yet, what we lack in quantity, we make up for it in quality; we fight on. A short while ago, somebody said, "John Duff, Local 439 is down"; and I said "Yes, we are down, but just start counting ten over us, and we shall get up". Although this may be our swan song, although this may be our last hurrah, the members of Local 439 will go down fighting. We want to tell you that all of the things that have happened to us, happened in the harshest possible economic climate, and I say to you: "Watch carefully, stand fast because this could happen to you with the type of government you are faced with".

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Munro): Any further discussion? All those in favour, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MR. J. FRYER (Economic Policy Committee Chairperson): The next statement that we dealt with this morning was the one entitled: *Full Employment and Fairness — The Workers' Agenda for Canada*. It has been debated and endorsed, and we recommend that this statement cover resolutions EC-10, EC-29-31, EC-36-37, EC-39, EC-45, EC-47, EC-52, EC-55-56, EC-67, EC-71-72, EC-76, EC-79, EC-89-90, EC-97-100, EC-102, EC-105-107, EC-109-110, EC-112, EC-115, EC-118-119, EC-127-128.

On behalf of the Committee, I recommend concurrence of the fact that that statement, debated and adopted earlier today, does, indeed, cover those resolutions.

MR. B. DESROCHES (Steelworkers): Economy to most people translates into the word "jobs". If you do not have a job, then economy is of little importance to anybody. When you then talk about jobs, you have to talk about the real issues of purchasing power, which, in my view, is the real engine that makes the economy go. If our brothers and sisters, as well as those who are unemployed, do not have some kind of purchasing power, then the engine of the economy stops, at least for those who do brothers not have that economic power. I would suggest that the Council make as strong a representation as we can to the federal government to stop the exploitation of workers by way of unemployment insurance, particularly where it adversely affects our members when they want to retire.

There are other areas that have come to light as recently as last week in Hamilton, Ont., where some of our unemployed brothers were called to act as jurors and to discharge their responsibilities to our society. Because of that, they received $10 a day for so many days to a maximum of $40, I believe; but they were denied unemployment insurance because of this. Now, that is a real injustice to our people. Surely, it is enough that our people are unemployed to start with, but then, when they are called to do their duty as citizens in our community, they are again denied their unemployment insurance.

That is the kind of thing that our governments are insensitive to. They are insensitive to the needs of our people, and we have to continue to tell them that, when our brothers and sisters decide that they want to retire so that they can make room in the work force for the younger generation, they should not have to pay an additional penalty by way of unemployment insurance decreases. There are so many things that are affecting our impending pensioners that they are reluctant to go on pension. They are reluctant to take their early retirement. We have to look at that.

The other point I want to make is not dealt with specifically in this paper, but it was dealt with in the earlier one today. It would be remiss of us if we did not expound on the virtues of having a shorter work week. From 1949 to 1952, when Canada reduced its work week from about 48 hours per week down to 40 hours per week over a three-year period, there was virtually no loss in wages and there were hundreds of thousands of jobs created; there was no real hardship. If we could reduce the work week all the way from 48 to 40 hours per week, with no real adverse effects on our society, then surely we must have the intelligence and the fortitude to be able to do it in 1986. If we cannot reduce it by 8 hours, then surely we can start reducing it by one hour at a time until we get it down to 32 hours per week.

The Canadian Labour Congress has to take a more direct and vigorous lead in educating the general public that we can take a shorter work week without any real loss in economic value to our purchasing power as far as workers are concerned, and I would urge the Council to do so.

MR. P. STIER (CALFAA): I support the Committee's recommendation, particularly since it includes resolution EC-31, which was brought to us by the CBRT & GW, Local 100. That particular resolution give us reasons for opposing deregulation and privatization. To give you one example that privatization does not work in regard to government services, let me bring to your attention the security screening at Canadian airports, which is done by private companies, while security regulations are enforced by airline companies themselves.

We, as Canadian airline flight attendants, and you, as travellers, should be very much concerned when you hear stories that a reporter can go through the security screening with mock weapons and mock explosives without detection. What is the problem? First of all, although there is in existence legislation which is supposed to secure our airports, it is enforced by untrained and underpaid personnel. We have seen the struggles that the Burns Security personnel had at the Montréal airports. These underpaid workers do not stay on the job long enough to have the experience. Nine months is the usual turnover of the average security personnel at the airport.

The Canadian Airline Flight Attendants' Association would like nothing better than to see the security screening of passengers and crew taken away from private corporations, and enforced by the Canadian government, with trained personnel who have had long-term experience. I do not want to see another Air India disaster, or any other disaster, and encourage all affiliates to force the Canadian government to do away with the privatization of security screening at the airports.

MR. D. ELVES (Edmonton and District L.C.): This document includes a couple of resolutions which deal with an issue which has been included in the document. I am grateful and glad about that; however, it has not been developed to the extent that that aspect probably could be. I am speaking of the issue of public ownership under democratic control. I suspect the reason that it has not been developed fully in the document is that the committee has attempted to deal with that, but it lacks specific ideas on how to follow it up. We have to start dealing with the nature of the follow-up of that question.

It is an issue that is important and appropriate to my home town in Alberta dealing with the crisis that is caused by the natural resources sector being dependent only on that, and the lack of diversification. One way to follow up on this question would be for the labour movement at all levels to invite affiliates to begin joint studies on how their particular industries could be run according to the agenda for the workers and for all the people of the country, in such a way that we do not find ourselves in a crisis caused by an industry run specifically for private profit, but simply for public need. If we analyze the industry, look at how it can be run differently according to democratic control and public ownership, we will not only start a follow-up process of this program, but we will be able to have a stronger hand at the negotiating table, because we will have a different and further understanding of the industry than the bosses, and we will also begin to popularize and strengthen the militancy of our own members. We will be able to see beyond the lies of the bosses. We will not be blaming OPEC, we will blaming the corporate agenda.

MS. F. RINGER (PSAC-National Component): Full employment and fairness is necessary, not only for us as workers, but for Canadian business. We must educate Canadians to the fact that privatization, deregulation and free trade will only lower our purchasing power, and, ultimately, send us into another recession.

I would like to comment on the fairness which was brought up; an example illustrates how unfair unemployment insurance can be. I come from Sudbury, originally. A few years ago, a miner was drawing UI when his wife passed away, and he had one day's UI deducted because he was not available to report to work; that is just totally abhorrent. We have to fight against this sort of thing. It will do no one any good if Mulroney gets away with what he plans.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Munro): I have no further speakers. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MR. J. MARTIN (USWA): I would like to bring a certain matter to the attention of the Chair, and more particularly, to the attention of Shirley Carr. Yesterday after the opening speech, I, rose on the question regarding the Ontario Professional Firefighters Association. Today, as a delegate, I have been given a pink piece of paper, outlining what went on at the Convention yesterday morning. I had a point of order, and given the nature of the circumstance — and I accepted the Chair's position on it — why should it not be recorded in this paper? It is important to me as a trade unionist that the CLC is going to follow through with the

commitment that Madam Chairperson gave me yesterday. I respectfully want an amendment to the proceedings as they were given out today, and I would ask for the support of the delegates because it is important to me.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Munro): the official record of the Convention will certainly show your point. This is just a quick version for the delegates to see. In the official record, it will certainly be there. Sister Carr's statement is recorded.

MR. J. MARTIN (USWA): Let me state again that if it can show that we sang, "Solidarity forever" and "O Canada" then when we have an issue such as a picket line of other trade unionists in the Hous of Labour, it is disgraceful that it is not shown in these documents coming back to the delegates on the floor. I am asking you, respectfully to amend these documents and bring them back to us tomorrow morning.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Munro): Your point is being taken and noted.

— The Convention adjourned for lunch at 12:30 p.m.

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1986
Afternoon Session

Secretary-Treasurer Shirley Carr called the Convention to order at 2:05 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I call on the Women's Committee to report.

WOMEN'S COMMITTEE

MS. N. HUNT (Women's Committee Chairperson): The Women's Committee met and considered resolutions W-1 to W-35 and reports as follows (document 16):

Resolution no. W-22 was referred to the Committee on Human Rights.

Resolutions no. W-1, 2, 5, 10, 15, 24 and 33 deal with the same subject matter. The Committee has drafted a substitute resolution to cover these seven resolutions. Sister Wood will present a slight change in the first resolution that we shall deal with.

MS. D. WOOD (Women's Committee Secretary): The amendment is in the resolution covering W-1, 2, 5, 10, 15, 24 and 33, and the change is in the 3rd "whereas" where it refers to "present daycare crisis in Canada"; the words should be "child care". The reason for the change is that the Cooke Report on child care specifically uses the words "child care" throughout the report.

The substitute resolution, as amended:

"WHEREAS quality child care services are a basic need for working parents; and

"WHEREAS licensed spaces exist for eight per cent of the children who need day care; and

"WHEREAS the recent Cooke Task Force Report has confirmed the present child care crisis in Canada; and

"WHEREAS the labour movement has continued to express concern about this lack of licensed child care, the increase in for-profit child care, and the poor wages and working conditions of child care workers; and

"WHEREAS problems exist with availability, accessibility, affordability, quality, and inflexibility in hours due to levels and methods of funding;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress call for the federal government to bring in a child care financing act to provide funding to the provinces, to develop a comprehensive, high-quality, non-profit child care system in Canada; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC pressure the federal government to implement without delay the 'good faith' grants recommended by the Cooke Task force Report as an immediate step to help alleviate the present child care crisis; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC continue its efforts to have affiliates, federations of labour and labour councils make submissions to the current Parliamentary Task Force on Child Care calling for federal government action as stated in Canadian Labour Congress policy."

The Committee recommends concurrence in this substitute resolution, on behalf of the Committee. I so move, seconded by N. Hunt.

MS. R. BAKER (UAW, Canada): I speak in support of this resolution, not only as a woman, because this is a problem for all workers in this country. Two years ago, I spoke to this Convention about the first industrial child care program and that program was negotiated in my own local union. We achieved two cents per compensated hour to be put into a fund by our employer. We have only now, two and a half years later, established that program, not because we have not been diligently working at it, but because, as the resolution points out, child care is a very expensive program for a full program that includes infant care and care for shift workers. It is so true that the government needs to implement grants to help alleviate this problem in establishing affordable child care programs.

For example, we found — because the cost of establishing full program including the staff, and all of the things that go with the Child Care Act, as well as supplying the premises either by leasing, buying or building our own premises are so costly — we were not able to put in place the kind of program that we had hoped for. However, I am proud and pleased to say that we have established a program. It is small and it is a program within the existing day care centre that we have in our city. So I urge the local unions here, the affiliates, the federations of labour and labour councils to keep up the fight for affordable quality child care at the bargaining table and at every level of our government.

MS. K. BOER (PSAC-CEIU): Times have changed and women are in the work force to stay. We have a responsibility to our members to fight for provisions that will enable them to enjoy a lifestyle comparable and equal to that of other people. We have a major problem with the lack of day care facilities and good affordable day care. We need to change this situation in order to give our members the opportunity to participate fully in all facets of today's society. I urge you to support this resolution, and to go back to your locals and submit a brief to the Child Care Task Force that is currently under way.

MS. D. MONTGOMERY (NUPGE-OPSEU): We have to work considerably more overtime than we did in the past, even though the government is saying that they do not believe that there should be overtime work. This is causing problems with both men and women on staff, especially with respect to child care. Some employees leave the office to pick up children at day care centres at the end of their regular shift. They now find that there is no child care available at night; some spouses work the night shift, and it becomes a real problem to find adequate care for children. We have to push for no overtime work, and employ more people on a regular full-time basis; alternatively, we have to have adequate child care facilities on a 24-hour basis. Our children are our future.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I shall now put the question on this substitute resolution. All those in favour of concurrence on the substitute resolution, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MS. N. HUNT (Women's Committee Chairperson): Resolution W-6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 16, 20, 23 and 27 have been reviewed by the Committee and a substitute resolution has been prepared which, we believe, covers the principles which were addressed in all of the resolutions.

MS. D. WOOD (Women's Committee Secretary):

"WHEREAS the struggle for real equality for women workers must be of central importance to the labour movement; and

"WHEREAS despite some progress, women continue to be concentrated in low wage jobs earning substantially less than men;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress pressure the federal government, and simultaneously encourage its federations of labour, to continue to pressure their respective provincial and territorial governments to enact or amend equal pay for work of equal value legislation to incorporate the following provisions where such provisions do not presently exist:

1. Universal application to both the public and private sectors;
2. Utilization of the collective bargaining process to achieve pay equity;
3. Special funding designated for pay equity adjustments apart from normal economic wage increases;
4. The achievement of pay equity for women to be realized by increasing the wages of lower paid workers, not by reducing the wages of higher paid workers;
5. Where job evaluation systems are utilized to establish equal pay for work of equal value, one gender-free plan shall apply to all employees;
6. An accessible complaint process which includes advice counselling and legal assistance to potential complainants as an inherent part of such legislation;
7. Mandatory reporting by employers of the employer's efforts to ensure the achievement of equal pay for work of equal value; and
8. Penalties for non-compliance; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC assist wherever possible in campaigns to achieve equal pay for work of equal value; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the issue of equal pay for work of equal value to be a major component of the next CLC. Women's conference; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC continue to encourage affiliates to negotiate equal pay for work of equal value including provisions designated to close the wage gap such as:

1. Across-the-board wage settlements rather than percentage increases to assist those (usually women) at the low end of the pay scale;
2. Equalization of base rates;
3. Elimination of increment steps, equal treatment in wages and benefits for part-time workers; and
4. Paid parental leave."

The Committee recommends concurrence in this substitute resolution; on behalf of the Committee, I so move, seconded by N. Hunt.

MS. M. GRIFFITHS (ACTRA): I would like to speak in favour of this motion, but from the perspective of equality of work opportunity. The cultural industries provide the largest number of jobs in this country. We are a very labour-intensive sector, and we generate over $7 billion of revenue annually. We, at ACTRA, have discovered that, although women in our jurisdiction have de facto pay equity with men, we do not have real pay equity because we do not have access to jobs. This is true for our women broadcasters, our women writers and our women performing artists. Most TV shows, movies and plays have more men employed than women, and the women who do gain employment as performers are largely in the under-thirty age group. We have completed a study showing that, in the voice-over category in television and radio advertising, men gain 86 per cent of the work, and women only 10 per cent. Therefore, I would like to congratulate the CLC.

Yesterday, I heard something truly remarkable in this hall. I saw two videos, both of them narrated by women; please continue this progressive trend. When you go back to your locals in all parts of this country, please speak out to your radio stations, your television stations and their advertisers. Tell them that you like to hear a woman's voice. Help us gain equality of opportunity.

MR J. RADOSEVIC (UFAWU): I come from an industry where nearly half of the workers are women, and which, at this time, is being ravaged by technological change; one machine is now replacing 16 women. For this reason, our organization has had the opportunity to discuss this question perhaps more than some other organizations in the labour movement. In the words of one of our members, a woman by the name of Emily Brown, who worked in our industry for thirty years as a fish-washer: "When women are replaced by the machines, they will have nowhere to go but to the unorganized section, there to work for a pittance." I belive that things like day care, tech change and equal pay are issues for all of us.

While the CLC, the labour movement, and the women's liberation movement have been successful in changing the attitudes in many sectors of society, there has been relatively little success in the industrialized section. This is not due to the fact that industrial leaders have nothing but male chauvanists among their ranks. The fact of the matter is that they are pursuing an industrial policy that puts extra profits into their pockets as the result of the over-exploitation in its structure and it is part of the overall fabric of our society. Women are a cheap source of labour, and they are a profit for the companies.

When you look at the kind of pressure that women put on the rest of the work force, when they are forced to work for lower wages, it is the same kind of pressure on the overall labour movement that any group of over-exploited and under-paid workers have. For this reason, these are not only women's issues. These are also issues of the labour movement, and the trade union movement has to resolve to fight these as much, and in the same ways as they fight any other trade union issue. If they do not, it will damage both the reputation, and the benefits we bring to our members in a way that probably nothing else can. I take my hat off to Fraser March and the Newfoundland employees who showed us the way to fight.

MS. J. DAWSON (Hospital Employees' Union): On the whole, this is a very good resolution; however, two sections contradict each other.

Under the first "resolved", no. 4 it states: "The achievement of pay equity for women to be realized by increasing the wages of lower paid workers, not by reducing the wages of higher paid workers"; then on the next page it states: "Across-the-board wage settlements rather than percentage increases to assist those (usually women) at the low end of the pay scale'. That one discriminates against the higher paid workers, and I feel that it would have been better had it established a base rate. In our union, we are going for the base rate for the male worker, and no female would be paid less.

MS. I. PETERS (NUPGE-OPSEU): In the public service in Ontario, our work covers a diversity of work places and a diversity of jobs. Over 50 per cent of our members are women. We suffer under extreme and sometimes very poor working conditions, both in the institutions of this province, and also in the offices, where some women can only survive at their jobs for a matter of two or three years, without having serious problems with their fingers, with their limbs and with their general health. We feel that bargaining for pay equity is one very important factor in upgrading women's work in our union. Remember that our employer with whom we have been struggling in the past has been our Tory government. Do you know what negotiating meant? Negotiating was a sham. Negotiating, bargaining and

getting collective agreements meant imposed settlements with no ratification. We believe that the guts of any trade union is our collective bargaining structure, and that is why we are fighting for equal pay through bargaining.

With the Liberal government coming into Ontario, and with the accord with the NDP, this brought for us, we admit, better bargaining, stronger bargaining and it also brought is the first equal pay legislation on the table in Ontario. So guess what they do? They bring in Bill 105, which applies to the public sector only. What we face in Ontario in our union is a major strategic question. It is the old divide and conquer strategy, i.e. pitting the public service against the private sector. However, we are sticking with unions in the public and the private sector, and we are sticking with unorganized workers and unorganized women in Ontario to get equal pay for all women in Ontario.

We are going to continue this fight until we get equal pay for all women in Ontario, because we know that what this does is bring up the wages of all working people. What this means for us and the challenge that we face in our union, is to get the strongest Bill 105, the strongest pay equity legislation we can for the public service, and to continue to fight for strong legislation, and strong collective bargaining for all other women. It was very encouraging to hear the messages from our brother who said that this means something for working people, because it is our brothers who will help us, and will be able to provide the impetus to this struggle, to make sure that they get this legislation in.

MS. J. DARCY (CUPE): Unfortunately, for the overwhelming majority of the members of my union in Ontario, what the government is looking at, as far as equal pay legislation, has loopholes in it so big that you could drive an army of trucks through it. Our union represents people who work in the public sector. The government has introduced a bill that, it says, covers the public sector, but it does not cover the majority of CUPE members who work in the public sector. In previous legislation that has been introduced, concerning the right to strike, wage controls, our members in hospitals, in municipalities, in day care centres and library workers are considered public sector, but when it comes to the issue of equal pay for work of equal value, we are not covered.

The Liberal government, while in opposition, said: "The time to study equal pay is past; the time now is for action." Now that they are in power, what they are talking about for the majority of women in the province is further study. They have sent a Green Paper Committee around the province, stacked with business people, and they are looking at options which could exclude the majority of CUPE members. What they are saying is that, in order to be eligible under legislation, you may have to be in a bargaining unit where women's wages can be compared to men's wages within the same bargaining unit. But in my union, as in many others, we have a large number of predominantly female and then predominantly male bargaining units; if we are not able to compare cross-bargaining units, then that legislation for us will be virtually meaningless.

The list is endless in regard to those sorts of loopholes that could exclude our members. They are talking about percentages of women workers that you have to have in order to be eligible. They are talking about the numbers of people you have to have working for an employer in order to be eligible. Our union, together with the Federation of Labour, and the women's movement, has been lobbying very hard with that Green Paper Committee, and we will continue to do so. We are standing together, public and private sector unions, until we have legislation that really does cover every single woman worker in that province, true equal pay for work of equal value legislation.

I am very pleased also that the resolution talks, not just about legislation, but also about collective bargaining. In our experience, and in the experience of the entire labour movement, many of the gains that we have succeeded in getting in legislation have come first at the bargaining table. Then we have been able to extend the rights that we have won to workers throughout the province, and throughout the country. We have a number of examples in my union of locals that have taken on the fight in the last couple of years, before legislation has come in, for equal pay for work of equal value; several locals have gone on strike with equal pay as one of their major bargaining issues.

I would like to tell you about one particular local that deserves a lot of credit for really pioneering in that fight, and I hope that some of the people from that local will speak to you later. A CUPE local in the City of York, the Board of Education local, with 227 members, only 10 of them women, went on strike last year. One of their priority issues was equal pay for the women cleaners who were classified as matrons, and, who were paid $1.10 less an hour for doing not just equal pay for work of equal value, but for doing almost identically the same work. Some of the equipment they used was different, but what those women said when they were on strike, and what their brothers said in support of them was: "We use that heavy equipment to clean our own floors at home. We shovel the walks at home and we can do it if you give us that additional money."

The really significant thing there was that that local stood together, brothers and sisters; they did not close the pay gap, but they got an increase of 30 cents an hour, and they now have another 80 cents to go. That is an example that we can all learn from. What it also shows us is that we have to continue to fight this on two fronts. We have to fight for the best possible legislation that we can get, but we also cannot put all of our eggs in that basket. We have to build a collective bargaining fight on the picket lines, if necessary, with all of us standing together until we really do have full equality for all the women in the labour movement.

MS. D. MacDONALD (UE): All the points in the resolution are extremely vital in the fight on this question. It is just a shame that we cannot have penalties imposed on the Ontario government for non-compliance when it comes to putting the legislation through.

In January 1985, a report was released by the Tory government which found that women in the public sector earned 73 per cent of men's incomes, compared to 63 per cent of the private sector. The report also estimates $1 to 3 billion annually are lost to Ontario working women because the province has not instituted legislation to ensure equal pay for work of equal value. This is probably a gross under-estimation. It is another area of backtracking where a government has gone back on promises to women.

In a letter to the President of the Ontario Advisory Council on Women's Issues, Peterson said during the election campaign, on April 11, 1985: "A Liberal government will enshrine the concept of equal pay for work of equal value. We will introduce mandatory equal value legislation, which covers both the private and public workers." In May 1985, under the Liberal-NDP accord, a section entitled "Proposals for Action in the First Session", is the statement: "Introduce legislation for equal pay for work of equal value in both the public and private sector". But in July 1985, in Peterson's policy speech to the legislature, he backtracked saying: "We believe in a staged approach to the implementation of equal pay." He made it clear that this approach was to placate the private sector.

To this day, nearly a year later, no details of the legislation are known. He said — and this is from the transcript of Hansard: "Our responsibility is allay the fears of the private sector." The equal pay coalition includes some 24 labour, women's community organizations, including the OFL, and has been highly critical of the Liberal government's move. Now, a new dimension may have been added to this problem. Heavy pressure is being placed on the Liberals from Bay Street to come on side on the free trade agreement, and effective equal value legislation would,

indeed, be a cost hindrance in keeping industry internationally competitive. The struggle for equal pay fits into the struggle for a labour's alternative economic program, which calls for the development of an industrial strategy to replace the export-oriented strategy government and business follow. Let us never forget that this is not just a women's fight; this fight will help low-paid men and women, immigrants, and yes, our own union brothers who are held back when our wages are kept back.

MS. L. TORNEY (LC Metro Toronto): I do not see any opposition to this resolution. What I hope you also understand is that we are involved in a real fight. In no way can we consider that we have won that fight in Ontario, and for those of you who have no legislation proposed whatsoever in the other provinces across this country, you had better realize you will have to fight hard just to get to where we are in Ontario today.

This is not just a women's fight. The sister before me said it: when women's work is undervalued and when women are treated as a reserve labour force, then, brothers, your wages are being pulled down. All you have to do is listen to what the corporate interests in this country are saying about equal pay legislation in order to realize the fight we are in. They accuse us of rhetoric. I have never heard such rhetoric as I have heard coming out of the mouths of the corporate business interests about equal pay legislation. If you listen to them, equal pay legislation is going to cause everything from a total downfall of the economy to World War III. There are some answers to what they are saying. This same argument has been used against every piece of workers' legislation ever introduced. They said that they would go broke over the establishment of a minimum wage and they said that they would go broke over a shorter work week. Let me give you the example in history that stands out, for me, as the most relevant when you look at the arguments that the corporate interests are using now. They said that they would go broke when they abolished slavery in the United States. We have an important step in this resolution. We are continuing to fight, and we must continue to fight, because the women of this country will no longer be used as slave labour.

MS. P. SANDERSON (NUPGE-BCGEU): I would like to draw the delegates' attention to points no. 4 and 5. I am pleased to see that an equalization is not going to be expensive to higher paid workers. To my sister who found some degree of ambivalence in that statement, if the percentage increase proposed does not reach a minimum for the lower paid workers, I would suggest that she think on that particular point.

Point no. 5, the Job Evaluation System, has been something that has plagued me all my working life. When I look at occupations which are quote "dirty" that men are involved in and occupations that need some degree of skill which men work in, I have to think of those areas that mostly employ female workers; areas like health-care workers who, daily, clean up human excrement; mechanics clean up excrement, but it is machine excrement. I would suggest that both are very difficult to handle, and you do not have to put on a sterile technique to handle machine excrement.

When it comes to skilled work, women, increasingly, are having to face machines that are very intricate, that require a lot of knowledge and that require a lot of expertise. When you start to talk about the way in which you are going to evaluate work, and look at the way in which you are going to evaluate work, there is a lot of work to be done, but, I am sure the CLC will put a lot of research into that.

In British Columbia where I come from, we have the added burden of the compensation-stabilization package. The Hospital Employees' Union, which negotiated a hefty hike for its lowest paid kitchen workers, faced Ed Peck and his butcher's knife, and their six per cent was rolled back to fit the stabilization package, with the result that those workers who come up to not too bad a settlement, found themselves in the miserable position of paying back anything in excess of that stabilization package, and it is coming off their current wage package.

In addition, women face this hidden discrimination of increments. If you happen to come from a mostly female occupation, you will find that it takes five years to reach the top of your scale. I do not see that happening in male jobs. You have a base rate, and that is what you are paid, and that is what I am looking for as a female worker.

MS. N. RICHE (NUPGE, Secretary-Treasurer): At the risk of sounding repetitious, I would like to make a few points on equal pay for work of equal value. What I want to state as clearly as I can is what equal pay for work of equal value is not. It is not a reduction in men's wages, and it is not only for the public sector, nor is it only for unionized workers. The money to correct the problem is not found in the negotiated increase, but in addition to. It is not implemented by way of an employer's job evaluation plan. The program of action is clearly stated in the resolution; we know what we have to do.

As we waged the battle in Ontario, and as we have seen some success in Manitoba, most of the other provinces are not even dealing with the issue at all. We have to put that high on our agenda and we have to talk equity as a major bargaining priority, and as a major challenge for legislated change. We know about equity in Newfoundland; we call it parity. We are still fighting for it in the Province of Newfoundland; i.e. on the street, and in defiance of the legislation. Their motivation is our motivation, because their fight is ours. How they are dealing with it, is how we deal with it, and their win is our win.

Economic equality for women is the bottom line. The bottom line for equality is economic equality. If we do not have economic equality, we do not have anything. When I say that you cannot be just a little bit equal, I mean it. Economic equality is absolutely essential, if the women of this country are to have any dignity, if they are to participate on any level; that is our ultimate and absolute goal.

MR. R. SLAGHT (UE): I would like to particularly address point no. 5 in this resolution: "Where job evaluation systems are utilized to establish equal pay for work off equal value, one gender-free plan shall apply to all employees." I want to tell you about the experiences that we had in our plant with that very point.

For many years, we worked under a two-plan evaluation system in our plant where we had a plan for predominantly male jobs, and another plan for predominantly female jobs. Of course, I do not have to tell you that the female jobs were always evaluated on a different scale of the males, and were paid something like $1.00 or $1.50 per hour less than the male jobs. Finally, legislation came in that said "Equal pay for equal work, and you should not have this discrimination." We were able to win, through collective bargaining in our plant, one gender-free system. We all heralded that as a success, which I have to say it probably was, because it is better than a two-plan system, and we were glad to have it.

But we found that we have had a lot of difficulty with that, Since it has been put in place because, in the plant where I work, we have approximately 50 per cent male and 50 per cent female workers. In all the predominantly female jobs we found that the company's job evaluation always came in still 2 or 3 or 4 labour grades under the jobs that were being evaluated in most of the predominantly male sections. Now, it is true that we cannot take this company to task for not paying equal pay for work of equal value, as far as men and women are concerned, because if we have a male who is working on a job which is predominantly a female job, he will be paid the same, and vice versa. However, we find that we have very few of those situations. The problem arises in trying to get the company to evaluate the female-dominated sector jobs, at the same rate as the ones dominated by males. You cannot take that to an arbitrator, because there is no discrimination, they are treating you equal. That fight has to

come right back into the shop, right back into your own company, and right back to the job evaluation program.

That leads you to another problem .You now have to get the full support of your membership to make sure that that job evaluation will be done equally .That is a very hard thing to do, because, whether you like it or not, they are just not prepared to put their male-dominated jobs on the line. It will take a lot of education. It is nice to have that, and I hope everybody is able to gain that in their collective bargaining, but once you get it, do not hope that that is the end of your problems, because you will have a fight to make it work in the shop.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called. I shall test the house. All those in favour of the question being put, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

I shall now put the Committee's recommendation of concurrence in the substitute resolution before the House. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MS. N. HUNT (Women's Committee Chairperson): I refer the delegates to resolution no. W-3.

MS. D. WOOD (Women's Committee Secretary): Resolution W-3:

"WHEREAS municipal and provincial funding for women's centres, day cares, transition homes, family support, counselling and crisis services is dependent upon federal funding, and all group services are chronically underfunded by all levels of government; and

"WHEREAS all such funding is short term; and

"WHEREAS in spite of Conservative election promises the Conservative government is so concerned about deficit-reduction that it fails to see that women's programs constitute an essential service and so has a dismal record, and no progress has been made; and

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Federation, through the Canadian Labour Congress, urge the federal government to honour all commitments to services and programs that advance the equality of women; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all current funding from all government sources be maintained and increased; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government remove all uncertainty regarding funding by announcing adequate long-term funding for these groups."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence; seconded by N. Hunt.

MS. M. POLLACK (CUPW): The resolution very much ties in with the previous debate which we had yesterday on privatization, deregulation and free trade. The federal Mulroney government wants to implement a free trade system which will be an attack on women's rights. It will mean taking away funding for social programs for battered women, for victims of child abuse, for victims of sexual harassment, for rape-crisis centres and for women's centres. We have to oppose this kind of action by the Mulroney government because it is very, very clear that it is an attack not only on women workers' rights, but on women's rights everywhere. We should support this resolution, but it also has to be tied in to an intensive and hard fought campaign against free trade.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I see no other speakers. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MS. N. HUNT (Women's Committee Chairperson): Resolution no. W-12 as amended.

MS. D. WOOD (Women's Committee Secretary): Resolution W-12 as amended:

"WHEREAS the negative impact of new technology is felt largely in clerical and office services; and

"WHEREAS these have traditionally been the domain of women; and

"WHEREAS women have had limited access to training in male-oriented skills; and

"WHEREAS women must have more access to new skills because of the current de-skilling by technology which threatens their traditional status in the labour force; and

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress continue to actively pursue the federal government to make more monies and programs available to train women for 'non-traditional' jobs."

The Committee recommends concurrence in resolution no. W-12, as amended, and I so move; seconded by N. Hunt.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): You have heard the recommendation of the Committee on resolution W-12 as amended. I do not see any speakers at the mike. All those in favour, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MS. N. HUNT (Women's Committee Chairperson): Resolution no. W-14.

MS. D. WOOD (Women's Committee Secretary): The Committee has amended Resolution W-14:

"WHEREAS the existence of pornography contributes towards the denial of women's equal place in society; and

"WHEREAS various women's and community groups have been active in the fight against pornography; and

"WHEREAS sex-related crimes in Canada have increased by 20 per cent since 1976 and statistics show there is a clear-cut relationship between pornography and sex-related crimes against women and children; and

"WHEREAS pornographic material in the workplace is one of the ways women have been harassed and demeaned in their jobs; and

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress strenuously continue its opposition to pornography in the workplace and in the community; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC work together with concerned groups such as the Canadian Coalition on Media Pornography on this issue."

The Committee recommends concurrence in resolution no. W-14 as amended, and I so move; seconded by N. Hunt.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee has recommended concurrence in resolution no. W-14 as amended. I do not see anyone at the mikes. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MS. N. HUNT (Women's Committee Chairperson): The Committee has prepared a substitute resolution for W-25:

"WHEREAS under the Health and Safety Legislation in Québec, pregnant women have specifically stated rights; and

"WHEREAS women workers in other jurisdictions do not have this right;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress pressure for legislation that will guarantee pregnant women the right to transfer or withdraw from work hazardous to themselves or the fetus; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in cases where there is no appropriate alternative work, these women workers be entitled to receive workers' compensation with no loss in seniority or benefits."

The Committee recommends concurrence in the substitute resolution W-25, and I so move; seconded by D. Wood.

MS. K. MADDISON (OPEIU): I wholeheartedly support this resolution. We have 53 collective agreements with only one person in them. A lot of those offices have VDT terminals in them where our employers are demanding that any employee work on those terminals. If we get pregnant and ask to be taken off those machines, there is no alternative work, because we are such small units of employees. Therefore, there must be some place that these women can go and get further assistance. I wholeheartedly support this resolution and the fact that we must have somewhere else to go. A lot of us are single parents, and we still have our commitments, and we must have some form of income. I ask that the delegates support this resolution wholeheartedly.

MR. A. SENECHAL (PSAC-AU): When they are pregnant or nursing, every woman worker in the public and private sectors in Quebec can exercise her right to withdraw from work, if she is accomplishing work hazardous to herself or to the child she is expecting. Provided they have a certificate attesting they are pregnant, all Quebec women workers who exercise this right are entitled to receive compensation from the Quebec Workers' Compensation Board, on the basis of 90 per cent of their salary. In 1983, 4,066 women workers exercised this right; and, in 1984, 7,102 did. From May 1, 1981 to December 31, 1984, a total of 14,987 women workers had exercised this right.

The second "whereas" expresses well the line of argument of women workers in the federal sector. None of them can exercise the right to withdraw as a precautionary measure. The Treasury Board, in its kindness, counters with maternity leave, compensatory holiday or annual leave. For example, I am a meat inspector, and I am aware of instances where a woman inspector who is pregnant may be working with a woman assistant, and both of them do not enjoy the same rights.

In every sector in Canada, there are women workers who cannot exercise the right to withdraw, because laws to that effect are non-existent. It is imperative that the labour movement start waging a battle with regard to this at all levels. The social impact is tremendous. In 1986, a couple should not have to undergo the loss of a child at birth or the birth of a sick one due to the working conditions or the lack of rights of women workers. All the federal MPs have been informed about this situation, and the only outcome was some good wishes. It is to be hoped that the CLC and the Federations will make the various first ministers understand that women workers in the federal sector are just as entitled to enjoy these rights and even to enjoy them under every jurisdiction.

I take this opportunity to thank the Quebec Federation of Labour for its role in obtaining the right to withdraw for pregnant women workers.

MS. J. IRENE (PSAC): When we speak of the right to withdraw for pregnant women, we are speaking first of all about health and safety and particularly of preventive measures to protect the health of women workers and that of the child they are expecting. When speaking of this right, we are not merely speaking about the health of today's workers, but of the health of the men and women workers of tomorrow, which could be endangered by exposure to toxic products, to cathode ray tubes, physical efforts normally required for a task that has become incompatible with the specific condition of a woman worker who has decided to have a child. More than ever, women workers of this country must be able to bear a child without endangering their health or that of their child.

The right to withdraw of pregnant women on the labour market is the solution that must be recognized by all federal and provincial legislation and this is why the CLC must show determined leadership in turning this demand into a victory. For the time being, the only women workers who are protected by such legislation are in Quebec. The adoption of such a measure would constitute a major breakthrough in the struggle that women are waging to be recognized on the employment market, but they must also be able to assume their social and biological responsibilities, so vital to all societies that want to continue to exist. Therefore, I urge the Convention to vote unanimously in favour of this resolution.

MR. P. STIER (CALFAA): We welcome this particular resolution, and thank the Committee for having brought it before this assembly. Canadian Airlines' Flight Attendants have fought, for many years, the marketing techniques of the airline companies so that pregnant flight attendants could continue working in the airline cabin. We have come a long way. It is only a little over a decade ago that, when a flight attendant knew that she was pregnant, she had to leave the job. Now, we have achieved for some of our employees the right to make a choice. Between the personal physician of the flight attendant and the flight attendant herself, she can decide to continue to work. However, the Minister of Transport is presently studying the ability of the pregnant flight attendant to evacuate passengers in case of an emergency or to act in an emergency; they want to again take away the right to continue working while pregnant. If they take the right to choose away from somebody, then compensation must be made.

MR. G. TITSWORTH (Steelworkers): The difficulty I have with the resolution is only that it does not include maintaining the rate. We had a situation where a woman assayer was found to be pregnant. She was being exposed to hazardous and toxic fumes and so she was moved. We had to go to arbitration in order to maintain her rate. I would suggest that, in any negotiation where there is the likelihood or the possibility that people are going to be affected, the language specify the right to maintain the rate if workers are transferred due to this particular situation.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I shall now put the question on the Committee's recommendation of concurrence in substitute resolution no. W-25. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

I would now ask the Committee to step down, and have the Committee on General Resolutions come forward.

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson): The General Resolutions Committee was charged with the responsibility of dealing with resolution no. G-1 to G-59. In addition, we were given an emergency resolution dealing with the situation of Canada Post at the St. Lawrence Seaway; and a resolution on property rights referred to us by the Executive Council of the Congress. We shall start with resolution G-2.

MR. T. WITTHAMES (General Resolutions Committee Secretary): Resolution no. G-2 as amended.

> "WHEREAS there is no national program of public education for child abuse; and
>
> "WHEREAS a program of public awareness on child abuse could and should be implemented;
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress call on the federal government to immediately develop and implement a continuing national program of public awareness focusing specifically on the needs of young children in relation to the prevention of abuse and ensuring better protection for children and youths who are victims; and
>
> "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Convention call upon the CLC to participate in a national awareness program."

I so move, seconded by R. White.

MR. G. McCABE (Canadian Union of Public Employees): Where it says: "Therefore be it resolved . . . I would just like them to strike out" . . . on the needs of young children", the word

"young". I find, from my experience, that many of the damaged children are teenagers.

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairman): You cannot make an amendment from the floor, but we will strike it out anyway.

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress call on the federal government to immediately develop and implement a continuing national program of public awareness focusing specifically on the needs of children in relation to the prevention of abuse and ensuring better protection for children and youths who are victims; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Convention call upon the CLC to participate in a national awareness program."

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MR. T. WITTHAMES (General Resolutions Committee Secretary): Resolution no. G-3 is on page 43 of the resolutions booklet and as submitted by the Nova Scotia Federation of Labour.

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Convention oppose any move on the part of the federal government to reintroduce capital punishment."

I so move, seconded by R. White.

MR. L. PUDDESTER (NUPGE-NAPE): As a rank-and-file member of the trade union movement for the last 18 years, as well as a correctional officer for the same length of time, I stand before this great Convention, and I oppose this resolution. After I draw a few parallels, I ask you people to also oppose this resolution. There are three great principles in this Convention that I am asked to support, and none of these principles has much effect on my livelihood or the members that I represent, but I shall go through them for you.

The first is free trade; it is very unlikely that free trade is going to hurt correctional officers, but as a member of this great Convention, when I stand on this floor and I listen to my brothers and sisters in the United Auto Workers telling me how it will hurt them to have free trade, then I, as a trade unionist, have no other choice but to stand and support their beliefs and stand behind them to see that their jobs and lives are protected.

The second one is deregulation, and it is very unlikely that we shall ever see a deregulated penitentiary, but I am sure that the people in the airline industry and the people in the Communications' Workers Union with their expertise, when they stand on this Convention floor, they want everyone in the hall to support them. I, as a trade unionist, support their rights and beliefs because I am a trade unionist and I go back to my rank-and-file members in the correctional field and tell them that these issues are important to these members.

The third one is privatization. I doubt very much if they are ever going to privatize the penitentiary; who would want it? But, again, I support my brothers and sisters in the Post Office who stand on this great Convention floor, and tell us that it is their livelihood that will be privatized. As a rank-and-file member, I again support them.

We adopted April 28th as a day of mourning. If the CLC keeps passing these kinds of resolutions then there will be a day of mourning for all correctional officers in this country; if we defeat it, there will still be days of mourning, but there will not be as many.

I would now like to turn to the Constitution, article 2, section 5. The resolution flies in the face of the Constitution. In section 5, it says that the purpose of the Congress is "to secure legislation which will safeguard the rights of workers". This resolution does not safeguard my rights.

In closing, I will turn to the rank-and-file members of this great Convention, and I would ask you to put your faith and trust in the correctional officers and the police officers of this nation who stand and say to you that we are experts in our own right, and we have to have these kinds of resolutions defeated.

MR. J. MARTIN (Steelworkers): I cannot understsand how a rank-and-file member of this delegation can stand before us today, and condone a murder or a killing of any human being regardless of the jurisdiction of any court. If this brother is telling this delegation that it is the corporate bosses and the members of employer groups who are slaughtering our brothers and sisters, and that this delegation is saying that we can enforce capital punishment on them, then I could agree with him. But if the House of Labour condones the taking of a human life, then something is wrong. I support the Executive and the Committee on their concurrence and I urge the delegation to, unanimously, support the resolution as it was read.

MR. W. CAMCHE (PSAC-USGE): This resolution before us is one that has been debated many times, and it becomes a very emotional issue. If this delegation thinks that they can make a decision for the people who work in the penitentiary services, and for the people who are the law-keepers and the law-enforcers of this land, with impunity, and say that we will not tolerate a government vote on capital punishment, they have no right to make that decision until they work on the front lines like the people who are protecting your very lives.

Let me say to you people here: You work for a week in a penitentiary, walk the floor with someone who has committed an atrocious crime — some of them that I would hate to admit to on this floor — and know that they are going to be there rubbing shoulders with you for 25 years, and then tell me, those of you who sit there comfortably, or who sit in your homes, or who do not wear a uniform in this land, and tell me that you would be comfortable not having this issue debated freely and openly in the House of Commons.

If there is one thing that I had a problem with in regard to Brother Broadbent's speech here this morning, it is that he and his party voted in block against the capital punishment issue when it was brought before the House.

I am saying to you people here: allow a free vote in the House of Commons, and remember that 87 per cent of the people of this country are demanding that vote.

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson): We should try to keep in perspective what the Committee's recommendation is. We are not non-supportive of security guards or the police institutions in this country, but we are saying that there is no evidence that capital punishment is a deterrent. I would just remind the delegates to this Convention that, about 100 years ago, several people were condemned to death by a court in Chicago; they were all trade unionists. So the issue before this Convention is not: "Do we support the security guards in terms of proper working conditions and proper safety in the penitentiaries?"; of course, we do. The issue before the Convention is whether or not we are in support of capital punishment per se in this country. I would again remind the delegates to not set our policy on hold because, if you do, the trade union movement will be in trouble every day of its life in this country.

MR. J. RICHARDSON (N.B. Fed. of Labour): I rise in support of the recommendation of the Committee. I would like to point out to the delegates here at this great Convention that what is at issue here is human life, not the working conditions of the policemen. Nobody can stand and say that we do not support the police or the guards in prisons in regard to their working conditions. For too long in the history of mankind, we have allowed this kind of butchery, of killing human beings; whether it is in war or by any other means, we spend billions of dollars trying to kill one another; and what does it do? It debases humanity. It hardens our conscience to the value of life; that is what is at issue here, i.e. life itself, and how precious life is to us, as trade unionists.

I can go into all kinds of horror stories. In fact, I just left Newcastle, N.B., where a nine-year old boy, last Sunday, was attacked outside the high school brutally assaulted and raped by a male. I cannot stand here and say: "Kill the individual who did it." As far as I am concerned, as a trade unionist, I do not have the right to take a human life, as an individual; and I do not believe that our society should have that right collectively.

Now, if we want to talk about murder, let us talk about the miners who go down the shafts and down into the mines in our country and who are killed nearly ever day; electricians who are electrocuted; others who work in pulp mills are killed; because the employer did not take the necessary safety precautions. Do we put the employer on trial? I can remember reading headlines in New Brunswick where a company was found criminally negligent of manslaughter, and was fined $300.

However, I do not want to confuse the issue. I would like to remind the delegates that the issue here is human life, and whether we, as individuals or collectively, have the right to take that human life.

MR. T. CONNOLLY (NUPGE-OPSEU): I am a prison guard, but being a prison guard is immaterial. The people of this country have the right to decide whether we want capital punishment or not, and I do not think that that decision should be just for prison guards and police officers. It should be for any violent crime where life is taken. Bob White has stated that it may not be a deterrent, but if you have capital punishment, you can bet that they will not do it again.

MR. S. BECKINGHAM (CPU): I cannot agree with some of the ideas expressed on capital punishment. Somebody said that we should have the right to vote on the noose; if I have the right to vote on the noose, then I want the right to vote on nuclear power, I want the right to vote on free trade, I want a lot of rights, not just on that one. The brother was saying that he had to support his brothers on the resolution; that is fine. There was a resolution five minutes before that said: "Order the federal government to put all this money into these programs for child abuse, for day care, for kindergarten, for women to bring up kids and have a free life". Maybe they would not have any crime, but would the brother support that? No. He is using some resolutions for his side, and he is using some for the other side.

Let us look at the whole thing. If Ed Broadbent and the New Democrats vote in block, that is fine, because when we come to the issues of medicare, pensions and anything else that we may need, they vote in block, and thank God. But for this one time, just once, on the noose, when we need a reason to put them down, they are voting in block over the noose. Somebody was talking about the front lines when he is protecting us; did you ever sit in a tavern with a criminal who never got caught?

It is unreal to want to play God. We do not agree with the court system in arbitration or workers' rights to organize, but for the noose, these crackpots in the judicial system are all right as long as it is to hang somebody; and you have the right to hang somebody. But as far as rulings for a labour arbitration in the courts, or that Lavigne case, they are crackpots if we lose. But we still want to give those same judges the right to hang somebody. I do not understand, maybe it is me.

This resolution is fine; we know workers are getting killed, and there is nothing we can do. They die back home; they die in your home towns and in mines, and in cities. We had an experience, a few years back, where a man in another plant was sent into a digester; he did not come out. They sent another man into the digester; he never came out. They sent a third man into the digester to get those two lazy bums out; he did not come back. Then they did a test, and the three men were dead, and the company was fined $1,000. If that same system applies to correctional officers, and they want the right to kill, I want that right too.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I hear the question being called. All those wishing the question to be put, please signify. Opposed. The question shall now be put.

Those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence in resolution no. G-3, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson): I just want to say in passing that there is no other organization in this country who has put that issue before 3,000 delegates, and debate it like we did. It says something about this labour movement.

MR. T. WITTHAMES (General Resolutions Committee Secretary): Resolution no. G-4 as amended.

"WHEREAS airlines have been deliberately transferring their reservations and ticketing work to travel agencies; and

"WHEREAS the vast majority of travel agencies are unorganized; and

"WHEREAS this results in an erosion of job security for organized airline workers;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress make its travel arrangements and purchase its tickets only through unionized air travel outlets wherever possible, whenever possible, and urge its affiliates to do likewise."

I so move, seconded by R. White.

MS. C. KRYZANIWSKY (UAW, Canada): We submitted resolution no. G-4, and I stand in support of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence on the amendment of that resolution. It has been watered down slightly by the addition of the words "wherever possible", but I have no problem with that, as long as the delegates go away from here, not only passing this resolution; and not only raising hands in support of it, but by going back to our organizations, and back to your local unions and ensuring that, when your travel arrangements are made for these types of conventions and all the travelling you do within your normal work and pleasure of life, that you make your arrangements through unionized travel agencies.

In most cases, that will mean dealing directly with the airlines. The brothers and sisters, who work for CP Air, Air Canada and are members of BRAC enjoy decent wages and decent working conditions because they have managed to become organized and bargain collectively, will thank you for doing it. I ask that you not only pass the resolution, but that you go back and make sure that it happens.

MS. V. WYLIE (CBRT & GW): I like this resolution; however, I think it had to be extended. I would like to move a motion to refer it back to the Committee in order to also include passenger railway outlets. There are 890 travel agents in Ontario that sell Via Rail tickets, and there are less than a quarter of them who are unionized employees for Via Rail.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Sister, I am sorry, but you cannot speak after you refer it. Perhaps somebody else could refer it for you, but you cannot speak on it.

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson): Why do I not help and say that we shall include it. It was not included in the original resolution, but obviously, it is a valid point and the Committee will include that in the resolution, when it is reprinted.

"WHEREAS railways and airlines have been deliberately transferring their reservations and ticketing work to travel agencies;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress make its travel arrangements and purchase its tickets only through unionized railway and air travel outlets, whenever possible, and urge its affiliates to do likewise."

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you for your consideration. Anyone else wishing to speak on the resolution as amended? All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please signify. Opposed. Carried as amended.

MR. T. WHITTHAMES (General Resolutions Committee Secretary): The next one we are dealing with is emergency resolution no. 1 which was submitted to the Executive Council by the SIU.

> "At the beginning of the 1986 shipping season on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Canada Post Corporation, without consultation or dialogue with the concerned parties, i.e. the maritime unions, arbitrarily closed forever the Marine Post Office at Lock no. 5 in the Welland Canal.
>
> "This was the only Canadian postal station at which Canadian mariners could get mail and receive personal and business correspondence.
>
> "They are left without means of correspondence with their loved ones or to do personal business.
>
> "Mariners come from one end of the country to the other. They need to have letters from home, more than the average citizen, because they work in a captive situation. The comfort that a letter from loved ones and friends brings is psychologically necessary in such an atmosphere.
>
> "The savings to Canada Post is $48,000 for the season.
>
> "It is a cruel and insensitive move on the part of a government agency, or a Crown Corporation;
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress and affiliated unions bring whatever pressure is necessary to bear on the Minister responsible for Canada Post Corporation, to re-open this very necessary means of communication for approximately 10,000 mariners and their families."
>
> I so move; seconded by R. White.

MR. R. THOMASSON (SIU, Canada): The arrogance of the Post Office in doing what they have done is unbelievable. There are 10,000 sailors out there, and they have just cut off their mail; they cannot mail out or receive any mail. If you add to that 10,000 their families, friends and the people they do business with, re their mortgages, finances, etc. then a very substantial number of people have been affected. If I can give an analogy here; take a town of 10,000 people where, one day, a pensioner calls in saying that he has not received his cheque as yet. He is told: "Oh, we forgot to tell you. We cut your mail off, and you are not getting it any more." Would they stand for it?

I guess it is somewhat the old bully routine that governments pull. There are sailors out there who need the service, but who will care whether we cut them off or not? Remember what we are talking about here, we are talking about $48,000 for a season. I can save that easily for them. I would just go up there to Ottawa, and cut a couple of those bureaucrats out, and that will save us $80,000.

We pay taxes, we buy stamps. Now they have suggested that we we have the company office send the mail through them. That is not a new thing to us in remote places; we do that all the time, but, we are not paying those companies, we are paying the Post Office. We are putting 34 cents on a letter. We have a right to mail service. They also say that the mail is not up to what it used to be, and they are not getting as many letters. I do not care if they are not getting three. That is like saying: "You do not have as much mail as you did last year, so we are going to cut you off because you are not giving us that much business." It is an arrogant, unfeeling thing to do.

Anybody here that has ever been in a situation where they were away from home, multiply that felling by 10, and you have a sailor. He may have a sick child, or he may just want to hear about his children. Are they growing up? Do they have new teeth? Or perhaps they have sick mother or a sick father. Sure, they can call home, Ma Bell would love that. The Post Office has also said that, with modern communication, they do not need mail. That is untrue. There is no way that a sailor can use any of the communications aboard a ship for a personal telephone call other than in an emergency.

There is an authorized petition circulating urging the reopening of the Post Office. We ask that you sign it, and we urge that you support this resolution.

MR. D. GAGNON (PSAC-UPCE): I am really glad to hear criticism from another organization concerning the Canada Post Corporation which we have been fighting since 1981. I am also glad to hear some of the comments made by the previous speaker. This is in line with the policy that we adopted unanimously on the Convention floor yesterday. I am glad to hear that someone now is saying: "We will implement the policy that we adopted."

I shall be a little negative now, because I was on the same Convention floor a few years ago, when we also adopted a strong policy in regard to Bill C-124, and I heard the same leaders and I heard the same stand, and I read the same paper the next morning and the CLC took a very strong stand. However, I was also one of these 500,000 members of the public service, who were shafted by the same employer.

I am suggesting to you here, this afternoon, that we have the best example right now. The reason why they are shutting down this Canadian service is simply because of the downsizing exercise which is definitely linked to the privatization of Canada Post. Fianance Minister Wilson tabled a budget a few weeks ago, where he gave Canada Post an impossible mandate to obtain, i.e. achieve self-sufficiency in two years; forget it. The end result is that this type of service will disappear; my job will disappear at Canada Post, and my union will also disappear at Canada Post. We are good when we adopt policies, now let us become good in implementing that policy.

Within the next couple of weeks, early in May, the government will deal with the Marchment Committee Report which deals with Canada Post, and the committee recommends that Canada Post not get involved with the parcel business. This is another service that you will lose. It is another service that big, non-unionized companies like UPS from the United States will take over. They will take over our services, our jobs, and our unions. I am proud to belong to the Postal Union. I am proud because I can stand here and say that the work that has been done by the Postal Union since its existence, can be perceived, has been perceived, and is still playing a role of leadership in the labour movement in this country. If, at this stage, we do not implement the strong policy that we adopted yesterday, I am afraid to say that the labour movement at Canada Post will maybe not win that battle.

If you want to help the brother from another organization who just screamed against Canada Post this afternoon, we had better put our act together, and get back to the government next week, to ensure that the Post Office, which is our heritage, will maintain the service and my union will be maintained at the same time.

MR. L. GAGNE (Steelworkers): I am in favour of this emergency resolution. To me, it is an illustration of the fact that since the fifties, the government is letting public services go to companies. Formerly, it did not cost very much to send a letter to Blanc-Sablon, to the Northwest Territories, to the most isolated spots and to cities like Montreal and Toronto, where the Post Office was making a bit of money. The government was subsidizing the service. A letter would go to the Magdalen Island via the Clark Steamship or to Blanc-Sablon by plane in any weather. These companies were subsidized. Lloyd Desmond Clark, of England, the owner of the Clark Steamship, would get subsidies

to service the North Shore people and those of the Magdalen Islands.

From 1950 on, the government started to favour friends of the Liberal Party and to contract-out the most profitable business. At the time, the Royal Mail was sacred; we knew that our letters would not be opened by just about anyone, although there have been inquiries, and we know what happened with the R.C.M.P., but let it go at that! Today, your letters can fall into the hands of just about anyone, of people likely to open letters, even of union people because their company is involved in another location, another conflict or God knows what! There is a multitude of sub-contractors decreeing what is profitable, just like it happened in the past between Air Canada and CP Air, between the CNR and the CPR and between the CN and the CP hotels. The trade union movement has the capacity, today, and is big enough to conduct an inquiry into the past.

I worked with the Canadian Maritime Board in the late forties and in the fifties; I was even at the 1956 CLC convention. We were not as big as we are today. Today, however, we could undertake an inquiry and put a stop to privatization, because this is akin to privatization. The government set an example by dropping essential services, the mail service that people in isolated places need. I bought a return ticket from Hall Airways to go to Chibougamau and when I wanted to return to Montreal, the company no longer existed; I never got my money back.

What does this show? It shows what we are capable of doing, if we want to. it is about time that we call a halt. Let us not wait until we are mixed up with the American government; there are other places in Canada where we have to call a halt.

MR. R. GREAVES (CBRT & GW): The postal office for seamen has been on the Welland Canal ever since the Welland Canal was built. About five years ago, they moved it from lock no. 8 on the Welland Canal to lock no. 5, but they were going to shut it at that time; there was a protest from the seamen and the government of the day decided to leave it there. Now, without any consultation, without any warning or any notification of any kind, they suddenly decided this year that they were going to save $48,000., and that they would close the Marine Post Office, which is a great convenience to the seamen of Canada.

Also involved in this are the four postal workers' jobs. The majority of the people, if not all of them, are disabled employees of Canada Post. This is quite apart from the inconvenience for seamen, many of them from the East Coast and the only way that they can get their mail is through the Marine Post Office. The government, very cynically, said: "Let them send it through the shipping companies." If a vessel goes through in the middle of the night, or at any time after office hours, there is no way a shipping company will be sending any mail they may have down to their ship to the seamen; they could not care less.

I would urge the delegates to unanimously support the recommendation of the Committee, and ask the Executive Council of the Congress to act on it as quickly as possible.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called; I shall now put it to the House. All those in favour of the question being called, please signify. Opposed. I shall call the question.

The Committee's recommendation is one of concurrence in emergency resolution no. 1. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation being called, please signify. Opposed. Carried.

I would now ask the Committee to step down. At this time. I would like to introduce to you a brother who has been an activist almost since he was born, in 1930. He started to be active in the international field in 1951. John Vanderveken, the General Secretary of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, has a very tremendous record of working with those who have been put into prisons, who have been tortured, who have suffered indignities and the inequities that we have seen around this world. He has also dealt very seriously with trade unions, worldwide, and numerous governments. He has dealt with the problems in Chile, Tunisia, Poland just to name a few.

During this long career in the ICFTU, Brother Vanderveken has successfully carried out our difficult missions in practically all parts of the world on behalf of all of us. He has stated and defended the international free trade union movement's viewpoint at the United Nations in New York, and certainly at the International Labour Organization in Geneva. Following the death of the ICFTU General Secretary, Otto Kersten, Brother Vanderveken, on November 24, 1982, was unanimously appointed the General Secretary.

ADDRESS BY JOHN VANDERVEKEN
General Secretary
International Confederation of Free Trade Unions

MR. J. VANDERVEKEN (General Secretary, ICFTU): I am very happy and proud to be here at your 30th anniversary Convention. Others have spoken and will speak on the irreplaceable role of the CLC in Canadian society. Allow me to say simply that the CLC has been every bit as irreplaceable at the international level, because you and the Canadian trade union leaders who were present at the creation of the ICFTU, as well as their successors, have always understood that international trade union work is as relevant and as necessary to the everyday concerns of the ordinary worker as are the trade union activities at the local, the provincial and the national levels. That is amply illustrated by the fact that, despite their heavy national responsibilities, the CLC leaders have never shied away from shouldering international responsibilities too.

May I just recall that Claude Jodoin was an ICFTU Vice-President; that Donald MacDonald was ICFTU President from 1972 to 1975; and that Joe Morris was an ICFTU Vice-President and Chairperson of the Workers' Group of the ILO; that Dennis McDermott was an ICFTU Vice-Président, and Shirley Carr, an ICFTU Executive Board member and Chairperson of the Workers' Group on the ILO Anti-Apartheid Committee.

I am here to thank you for the contribution that the CLC has made for the betterment of conditions of life of the workers of the world.

I am happy and proud to do that, not only on my own personal behalf, but on behalf of the 84 million workers organized in the 146 national trade union organizations belonging to the ICFTU in 99 countries.

Permit me to go a little bit deeper into the significance of these figures. Of course, they give an indication of our representativeness, but they also give an indication of the nature of the ICFTU.

As I said, we now have organizations in 99 countries. That means, of course, that we are a world-wide organization, but with a membership in virtually all countries of the world with the exception of those where it is prohibited by governments to belong to an international like ours. These figures show clearly too, what the ICFTU is not. Indeed, the ICFTU is not an organization of trade unions of a particular block. In the ICFTU are grouped together national centres of countries from the industrialized and from the developing world; from countries which belong to the non-aligned movement; and, as a matter of fact, from certain countries which may not even have diplomatic relations between them.

Why do these organizations of such different backgrounds, and operating in such different political contexts, choose to be members of the ICFTU? Because they want to have at their disposal an effective instrument for daily solidarity work at the international level, just like you, at the national level, need the CLC. Never forget, the ICFTU is not in business for developing foreign policy for trade unionists, or trade union diplomacy. The

ICFTU is in business to elaborate and carry out a policy of international trade union solidarity. And to achieve what? The founders of the ICFTU gave it a motto 37 years ago, which is as valid today as it was then: "Bread, Peace, Freedom".

Bread: That is to achieve economic and social justice, economic and social democracy. What is the situation today? The following are the tragic figures: 32 million unemployed in OECD countries, and 800 million people in the Third World barely surviving in abject poverty. And what have we seen on the part of most governments in the recent past: policies of negativism seeking to explain inaction, rather than point the way forward, with an all-out attack on the twin problems of unemployment and poverty in North and South through a concerted policy of which a new deal for the Third World must be part and parcel. That is why at the ICFTU, we have been concentrating our recent policy work on the debt crisis and the closely related problem of monetary instability. Today a window of opportunity is opening up. Inflation is down, interest rates are coming down and oil prices are falling. Now is the time to act to create employment and to combat poverty. Failure to do so on the part of the industrial powers would be no less than irresponsible. That is what we, as a delegation of the international free trade union movement, told the Prime Minister of Japan, when we met him, last week, to present to him the trade union alternative policies prior to the summit which will take place in Tokyo in the next few days. He said that he would convey our position to his fellow summiteers. Whatever their decisions, we, in the ICFTU, will continue to hammer on these themes, and develop our strength for more effectively influencing the policies at the international level, for example, at the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank.

Peace: I happen to believe very deeply that the international free trade movement is the greatest single movement for peace, because peace is linked to the state of human rights in the world. The preservation of peace is dependent on the state of the economic and social justice in the world. The exploitation of the poor by the rich, the oppression of one people by another, the oppression of one race by another, and the oppression of a people by its own totalitarian government are all causes of tension, of conflict, of war within and between countries, and the trade union movement is committed to the eradication of these root causes of war.

As regards security and disarmament, I will be proposing to the Executive Board of the ICFTU, which is meeting three weeks from now, a major initiative which will, I hope, put the international free trade union movement in a position to make a significant contribution to the achievement of a peaceful world, and conditions of freedom and justice.

This leads me to the third of the ICFTU's great aims and principles: *Freedom*. Freedom means respect for the basic human rights and for one of their logical and necessary extensions: trade union rights. We insist that every country, no matter what its wealth or poverty, no matter where it is situated, no matter what its real or supposed system, should respect fundamental trade union rights. We fight to have these rights respected in the East, in the West, in the North and in the South; in Chile and Poland and Turkey and in South Africa, and also in Canada because, some time ago, together with the CLC, we submitted complaints to the ILO for the violation of trade unions rights in four Canadian provinces. The ILO sent a fact-finding mission here, and subsequently ruled that these governments were violating basic workers' rights. We are glad that we have been able to show solidarity with the Canadian workers on this issue. That is what I meant when in the beginning I said that the ICFTU is not in the business of diplomacy, or foreign policy. We are in the business of workers' solidarity. And that workers' solidarity should never be sacrificed on the altar of diplomatic considerations or on the complexion or the nature of the regime that is committing violations of basic human and trade union rights.

Let me single out one very particular case, South Africa. There we have a very clear example of how workers' rights cannot be seen in isolation from general human rights. We, in the ICFTU, did not discover apartheid yesterday. When, twelve years ago, it became realistic to think in terms of an all-out effort to organize the black workers in anti-apartheid unions, the CLC and other major trade union centres took a historic decision to co-ordinate, through the ICFTU and together with the trade unionists of South Africa, an active policy of assistance to the emerging black trade union movement. This policy, which became the most important to be devised in the history of the ICFTU, contributed to the success of the organizing efforts of the black workers. Twelve years ago, there were in South Africa about 70,000 organized black workers. Today, that number has grown to 800,000 and all in anti-apartheid unions. But also, today, we must pledge our continuing support for our brothers and sisters in South Africa in response to the appeal of our friend, Jay Naidoo. Apartheid cannot be reformed, it must be abolished. In that fight, our message is: You are not alone. We demand the release of all political prisoners, including Nelson Mandela; the repeal of all apartheid legislation; and the immediate introduction of democracy on the basis of universal adult suffrage. Until that is achieved, the ICFTU will continue to press its policies — worked out with the South African trade unionists — calling for comprehensive, mandatory sanctions against the apartheid regime, campaigns for disinvestment, and the targeting of multinational companies for boycott action if they are found to be victimizing black workers. On behalf of the ICFTU, I ask you to respond fully to this call, because I think we can legitimately ask you: if not now, when?

I would like to conclude by thanking you most sincerely for the concrete help given by the CLC to Third World workers, via the ICFTU. You pay your dues, you even contribute significantly to our solidarity fund. This is fine, for it allows us to increase our international work. But just as important is the fact that you have placed Canadian trade unionists at our disposal to work with our Third World friends in Latin America, the Caribbean Islands, Africa, and Asia. These Canadian brothers and sisters are doing a tremendous job, at times under hard conditions. Their example is giving us courage to continue in the best spirit of international solidarity. Brothers and sisters, the world of today is difficult, and the problems are complex. But, as I always say, the more complicated the problems are, the more important and urgent is it that our action be based on the simple and lasting values and principles of trade unionism.

Shirley Carr said it and repeated it yesterday: unity, solidarity. Not in words but in action. By remaining united within the CLC, by remaining united with the ICFTU, the next thirty years will belong to you, the future will belong to us.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): As I said, he is a brother, a friend, a social democrat and he certainly is sincere and capable in everything that he does.

I would like to introduce two guests: Michael Boggs, Secretary-General of the International Federation of Chemical, Energy and General Workers; and Ernie Layboff, International President, Aluminum, Brick and Glass Workers.

ANNUAL DAY OF MOURNING

MR. R. MERCIER (Executive Vice-President, CLC): The City of Brandon, Man., proclaimed April 28th as a Day of Mourning in recognition of injured and killed workers; so did the City of Winnipeg, Man. The Province of Manitoba, under Premier Howard Pawley, has also declared April 28 as the day to recognize killed and injured workers throughout the province. The Minister of Labour in the Manitoba government has recognized April 28th as a Day of Mourning and has endorsed the proposal that all civil servants in the Manitoba government can observe this day by a cessation of work and one minute of silence on April 28.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Those are the kind of announcements to make, are they not?

The next order of Convention business is the International Affairs Policy Statement of the Executive Council which is document no. 20. if there is still time, we will go into document no. 8, the report of the Committee on International Affairs.

(A video presentation on the international involvement of the Canadian Labour Congress preceded the report of the International Affairs Committee).

MR. G. DOCQUIER (International Affairs Committee Chairperson): The text of the policy statement on International Affairs is in Document 20:

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND THE PURSUIT OF HUMAN DIGNITY: A CANADIAN LABOUR RESPONSE

"In the years since the formation of the CLC, workers in Canada have looked out over a world of change but one marked by tragic consistencies.

"Wars have been fought, whole peoples have been slaughtered. The torturers have left their marks on countless thousands.

"We have seen the emergence of new labels, such as the Disappeared in Argentina; and, though too rarely, the emergence of new institutions bringing light to a dark world. The CLC is honoured to have helped Amnesty International in its first quarter century, and is realistic enough to know we will have to help in the coming one.

"We have witnessed and assisted the birth of genuine peace movements, expressing the will of peoples and rejecting any who would subvert that will.

"We have worked through our international organizations, particularly the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the Commonwealth Trade Union Council, to promote trade union solidarity, workers' unity, and the elevation of a worker's dignity as a guiding principle for governments everywhere.

"The *pursuit of universal human dignity* is never easy, and it is made more difficult by the posture of some political leaders. Our actions must have nothing in common with, and do not contribute towards, the hysteria they generate in the often one-sided pursuit of human dignity.

"In its first 30 years, the Congress has stuck to its principle of standing up for people's rights wherever they are violated. It has always fashioned policy to best represent the interests of Canadian workers.

"It is the conviction of the CLC that those interests include our cogently arguing for full but realistically oriented dialogue between the superpowers.

"This commitment should characterize the approach of the Canadian Labour Congress as we continue to most effectively promote the cause of world peace as elaborated in the document adopted by the 1984 Convention. *Peace, Security and Disarmament: A Canadian Labour Response.*

"This established the primacy of efforts to achieve peace but it has not been utilized to strengthen calls for the pursuit of stability between the superpowers at the expense, if necessary, of 'political' considerations such as human rights.

"The CLC has always been convinced we could contribute on both fronts, avoiding any suggestion of a trade-off. Workers deserve, and the world needs, respect for human and trade union rights and a world at peace.

"This approach is reflected in our 1984 Convention policy document and is to be seen in those other pronouncements which have preceded it. Our concerns about peace are not new, and were being advocated long before it became fashionable. They have always been frank and objective, criticizing or encouraging either or both superpowers when and where necessary, publicly or privately.

"In this we may differ from other national trade union centres. However, the world situation remains so threatening that there is surely value in carefully ensuring that they are well aware of our concerns and we of theirs in the hope that the cause of peace is thus strengthened. We have already brought such an approach to bear on our relations with the All-China Federation of Trade Unions.

"The CLC certainly has no wish to engage in an activity which could be misconstrued as evidence of a lack of seriousness on our part concerning human and trade union rights, by foreign organizations as well as by those seeking to wring narrow political advantage out of the peace initiatives we are compelled to take.

"The latter concern we know to be manageable, and as for the first concern, there are ways of pursuing our objectives in both the field of peace and human rights, ways that only an organization such as ours is well placed to develop. Doing so will be a priority for the CLC.

"In the course of the next two years, we will work as a matter of priority on ensuring that our concerns are well known to the Canadian and other governments, the public at large, and other labour movements.

"Of course, the concerns of the CLC remain boundless.

"Multilateralism is the key to a better world and the need for a strong United Nations' system is as pronounced as ever. The CLC remains convinced that Canada's interests are well served by the maintenance of a U.N. system committed to promoting universal respect for its Charter, the Declaration on Human Rights, the Labour Standards of the ILO, and the integrity of the various U.N. agencies.

"We rejected the efforts of the U.S.S.R. to undermine the monitoring work undertaken by the ILO in the field of labour standards, and we reject the decision of the U.S.A. to turn its back on UNESCO.

"Multilateralism is not important at the global level only, and Canada should do all in its power to assist regional co-operation, such as exemplified in the intent of the Contadora initiative, which could do so much for peace in Central America. Canada cannot alone bring peace to the conflicts which rage around the world, but it can provide assistance to those who try to dampen the fires of conflict in their region, helping them to achieve peace and social justice.

"*Peace, Security and Disarmament*, which the 1984 Convention addressed in detail, are not concerns for the superpowers only.

"The Canadian government should recognize that the pursuit of peace should have priority over all international political objectives, as important as these remain; it should engage in promoting realistic detente between East and West and the resolution of conflicts through negotiation and agreement.

"Welcoming the start made in Geneva, we recognize that such negotiations can never be easy, but the prize is worth the effort.

"An agreement for both superpowers to abandon the development of weapons in space, either for satellite destruction or for ballistic missile defence, would profoundly improve international stability in the coming decades. In this spirit, we have opposed Canadian participation in the Strategic Defence Initiative announced by President Reagan, and we once again declare to the world NO STAR WARS!

"Some of our political leaders appear to think that the *United States and Free Trade* go together like love and marriage. We

remain convinced that trade policy must be a subordinate element in an actively interventionist economic policy. It should be dealt with on a sector-by-sector basis; it should be designed to reduce our overall dependence on foreign trade; and it should be designed to diversify Canada's trading partners. The cost of free trade is too high for Canada!

"The *International Economic System* affects all our trading partners, as well as ourselves. Though the United States will remain Canada's principal trading partner, and we theirs, our economic interests can only be secured through serious attention to the performance of the international economic system. We are alarmed by the debt crisis, the fall of commodity prices, and the speculative flight of capital which otherwise could be used to build jobs.

"Whatever the reasons for the lack of progress, we believe that there is a pressing need for an improvement in North-South economic and political relations, and the initiative lies mainly, though by no means wholly, with the North. We will continue to assist the efforts of the ICFTU in developing a trade union response on this and other issues.

"In the various regions of the world, poverty, conflict and tension abound. Canada is immune to none of this, perhaps especially not in the Pacific Rim and Asia generally. The Canadian government, as a major provider of development assistance and as a leading member of the Commonwealth, should make every effort to assist the emergence of a peaceful solution to the problems of Commonwealth countries in Asia riven by poverty and intercommunal violence. *Sri Lanka* is a case in point where the CLC, working through the Commonwealth Trade Union Council, is making a direct contribution. Another direct focus of our efforts in Asia has to be the *Philippines*, where we have consulted the TUCP, KMU, and other labour organizations about ways in which we can help the Filipino workers achieve the full realization of their rights. With them, we were convinced of the need to see the emergence of real change in the Phillipines now made possible with the end of the Marcos regime.

"The dramatic events leading to the overthrow and exile of the corrupt dictator Marcos and the installation of Cory Aquino as the new President of the Philippines have overshadowed labour events in this much troubled country, for which Canadian workers feel so much solidarity.

"The two major trade union organizations in the Philippines, TUCP and KMU, determined their election strategy independently. The KMU decided to officially boycott the elections but many of its affiliates backed Aquino. The TUCP took no official position on the elections but many of its affiliate leaders openly backed Aquino and the TUCP was a major backer of the organization, Namfrel, which was set up to prevent Marcos' thugs from rigging the balloting.

"Once the initial dust settles, President Aquino will be faced with enormous difficulties and will need help. The main patronage machine of Marcos was established in the more than 50,000 village councils in the Philippines, and Aquino will need to quickly decide how to confront this corrupt infrastructure which can both frustrate any meaningful attempt at reform and deny any real possibility for many NPA guerillas to abandon the armed struggle and return to their communities. Similarly, the economic crisis in the Philippines will continue to make the country extremely vulnerable to U.S. pressure for some time to come. It is clear that the Filipino workers will need assistance in the coming years, and the Canadian Labour Congress stands ready to play its part.

"The United States is not the only super power to exert major influence in the Asian Region.

"We have condemned the Soviet invasion and continued occupation of Afghanistan. We call upon the Canadian government to strongly encourage the Soviet Union to withdraw its occupation forces from Afghanistan so as to permit that country to determine and follow a path of democratic government at peace with its neighbours.

"While we recognize that Canada is unlikely to play a decisive role in the *Middle East*, we urge the Government of Canada to contribute to peaceful settlements of the conflicts in that region. It remains our conviction that peace has to be built on negotiations which reflect two sets of obligations. For their part, Arab countries and peoples must categorically accept Israel's right to exist and live within secure and recognized boundaries.

"For its part, Israel must honour the Camp David Accord, as it did in withdrawing from the Sinai, by recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements, which include a national homeland for the Palestinians.

"We encourage the Canadian government to continue its efforts with the *African* governments and through Canadian non-governmental organizations to bring immediate relief assistance to the peoples of the region. We also encourage the Canadian government to sponsor long term development projects in the region with a view to reversing the effects of the drought and famine.

"Natural disasters are not alone in bringing tragedy to Africa. Apartheid, by whatever name, still denies to black South Africans the goal of democratic majority rule sought by liberation movements such as the ANC, PAC and SWAPO.

"In the view of the CLC, efforts at persuasion through dialogue with the Apartheid regime in South Africa can only succeed when backed by economic sanctions, and we urge the Canadian government to take strong and decisive action. This should include an end to Canadian investments not only in South Africa but also in Namibia which is still illegally occupied by South Africa. It should include the promotion of a campaign of disinvestment of current Canadian holdings and here unions have a special responsibility to ensure that their pension plans are in no way invested in Apartheid.

"Welcoming to this Convention a delegation from the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), and recalling the historic contribution to the struggle made by the South African Congress of Trade Unions (SACTU), we will play our part by providing assistance to the black trade unions in South Africa and by encouraging anti-apartheid groups in Canada with a labour focus.

"In March, the South African government announced an end to the State of Emergency which has been used extensively to harass and imprison trade union and political activists. It is likely that the State of Emergency regulations will simply be traded for new police powers in the long run, but the move was generally welcomed by South African trade unionists in the hope that their detained colleagues would be released. The CLC, along with OXFAM, the churches and other groups, has been able to secure and forward substantial financial assistance from the Canadian government for the humanitarian relief of the detainees' families.

"The Canadian government should increase its commitment to supporting efforts of the other countries of Southern Africa in order to show them that Canadians are prepared to help in their time of need and beyond, when the South African menace is resolved.

"Canada needs to increase its overseas trade, and increased Canadian involvement in Central and South America provides an opportunity for mutually beneficial relationships. However, in stating that *Latin America* is an important and growing market for Canadian exports, the Government of Canada must also recognize that commercial relations cannot be considered independently of the performance of governments vis-a-vis internationally recognized norms of human and trade union rights. As a bare minimum, the Canadian government must ensure that no export permits be issued for Canadian exports to *Chile* of a military or paramilitary nature.

"The CLC also favours the right to self-determination of *Nicaragua* and all sovereign states in our hemisphere while demanding full human and trade union rights for all Central American peoples, a condition impaired by foreign military intervention. They must be allowed to freely determine their own course, and their union movements deserve our support.

"U.S. foreign policy continues to be the most serious problem for Nicaraguans and other Central Americans and we demand that the Reagan administration leaves Nicaragua alone! It is significant that both Nicaraguan and U.S. political leaders have proclaimed 1986 as a 'decisive' year for Nicaragua's future. In the U.S., President Reagan mounted a major campaign to obtain Congressional and Senate support for a $100 million aid package for the 'contras'. His rhetoric has now reached the point where he lists the Sandinista Commandantes along with Duvalier and Marcos and he has argued that a failure to approve the 'contra' package could provoke a situation where 'our own boys' are involved in the conflict directly. Militarily, there is little likelihood of the 'contras' achieving an overthrow of the Sandinista government without direct U.S. involvement which we will oppose. It is the conviction of the Canadian Labour Congress that increased U.S. involvement in the conflict would destroy the prospects for a peaceful settlement negotiated through the Contadora process which President Reagan has consistently tried to shove aside, and which we must defend.

"We unhestitatingly condemn the Reagan policy towards Nicaragua and we condemn military intervention in the region by any country. We will urge the Canadian government to actively oppose such interventionist policies and we believe that bilateral aid should be withheld from any country serving as a base for military intervention. The workers of Canada put these countries on notice!

"In all regions of the world, we have proposed that people-to-people aid be emphasized by our government, which has many willing Canadian 'partners in development', particularly in those instances where government-to-government aid can strengthen a repressive regime.

"This is not in the interests of the Canadian people, and the CLC will never accept that a Government of Canada strengthens repression, and thus weakens the framework within Canada must grow.

"The example of *Haiti*, a poor country in our hemisphere with strong links with Canada, is important here.

"Soon after the 15th Constitutional Convention, the CLC participated in a trade union fact-finding mission to Haiti which held out little hope for trade union development in the country while Baby Doc Duvalier continued to rule. Popular unrest in Haiti during the later part of 1985 unexpectedly provoked a crisis deep enough for Duvalier to depart, leaving the country in a state of economic chaos and leaving behind a legacy of repression which will take years to overcome even with assistance from Canada.

"The CLC's principal contact with the Haitian workers during the past was with those hundreds of thousands who lived in exile in the Dominican Republic, who in turn worked with those Haitians who came to the Dominican Republic to work on sugar estates in a state of virtual slavery.

"The present situation has immeasurably improved with Duvalier's departure but continues to be volatile because of the lack of political and social infrastructure. Prior to this 16th Constitutional Convention, the CLC sent two representatives to Haiti as part of a fact-finding mission sponsored by the ICFTU. The purpose of the mission was to assess the situation and to determine how international solidarity with Haitian workers might best be accomplished. All Canadians, not just trade unionists or Canadians of Haitian origin, will hope that their country can assist in the rebuilding of Haiti, and the improving of life in our hemisphere.

"The Government of Canada carries a major responsibility to the people of Canada which can only be met by encouraging their input into the making of foreign policy and the conduct of international relations whether the issue be aid to Haiti or anything else. The CLC will play its part by continuing to put forward its policies and to press the claims of workers like ourselves, who are all too often in mortal danger in a troubled world.

"In this way the pursuit of Canada's international relations will reflect Canada's values, and though we can ask for nothing more, the CLC will accept nothing less."

MR. G. DOCQUIER (International Affairs Committee Chairperson): I move acceptance of this statement, seconded by R.C. Smith, Committee Secretary.

MS. J. ARMSTRONG (UAW, Canada): This paper recognizes that there are tremendous struggles being waged by workers throughout the world whom we must support. If this paper expresses the level of commitment of the CLC to international solidarity, we are doing very little. The paper states that we support the goals of the liberation movement in South Africa, yet, what support are we giving to the organizations leading that struggle? Jay Naidoo who spoke to the Convention from COSATU, the new powerful, above-ground federation, clearly stated that the struggle is a political struggle for freedom. To achieve that freedom, COSATU recognizes and supports the active role played today by the ANC and SACTU.

Where is the recognition of the unity in the struggle of the ANC, COSATU, and SACTU? Not in this policy paper. Where is the recognition of COSATU? Are we not prepared to do more than welcome COSATU? This paper says nothing more than that. Where is the commitment to action? The brothers from COSATU left this country to face the racist regimes and vigilante attacks on May Day, with nothing more concrete than what was left of their pocket money. Where in this paper is the commitment to the financial, political and material support for COSATU? They need it, and they need it desperately now. To give formal recognition at this Convention to COSATU, to give immediate financial support is essential because we will be telling the racist regime that they will not be allowed to smash COSATU; and that we are clearly in solidarity with the struggle for those workers against racial exploitation. I thank the CLC for allowing the brothers from COSATU to speak, because that message will get back to the racist regime, i.e. that 3,000 delegates gave a standing ovation to the brothers from COSATU.

Where is the commitment to a sanctions campaign? The paper states correctly that economic sanctions are the key. We cannot wait for the Canadian government to act and we need no more studies of apartheid. While the Canadian government waits for the Commonwealth to deliberate on South Africa, and Maggie Thatcher to collaborate with South Africa, the regime imprisons thousands; and hundreds are murdered in their march to freedom. The CLC should be leading the affiliates in a sanctions campaign. My union, the UAW, and others are already undertaking a campaign to rid our workplace of the products of apartheid. The recent week of action, organized by the SACTU Solidarity Committee, demonstrated that workers want to take action and will take action. Over 30,000 workers took part in that week of action, including my own local of airline workers. The CLC should be leading two million workers in a sanctions campaign with the slogan: "Sanctions now". My union, the UAW, and many other affiliates have played a leadership role in supporting the underground work of SACTU. We need the recognition of that, and the recognition of the work of SACTU in this country.

Finally, the last line states, "We can ask for nothing more." The black workers of South Africa are asking for more, COSATU is asking for more, the unions in this hall are giving more, because they understand the true meaning of international solidarity. We must do more because the slogan is: "An injury to one is an injury to all."

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): So that there is no misunderstanding, I wanted to wait until this came up on the floor before I

told you, but we did not allow our brothers to go back to South Africa empty-handed. They went with a cheque, the first cheque of $25,000, to assist them. I suggest to you also that there are many affiliates sitting in this hall, who already have started to put money into a solidarity fund for them. Perhaps, at the end of the week, we can let you know what that is, too. So, we have started to do things in addition to saying them.

MR. W. MUNDLE (CUPW): I rise to speak against the Committee's policy paper for two reasons. First of all, I find it very vague, particularly with respect to the type of work we are going to do in Central America. It is time that we lift our heads out of the sand and recognize the work that the SACTU Solidarity Committee is doing here in Canada. The CLC has not done that.

I shall speak mainly on the Central American issues. One thing that bothers me is that I stood here a couple of years ago and talked on the same issue. The policy paper then was very vague, and I asked the question about what trade union centrals we would recognize in Nicaragua. I was told that it would be all of them, and that we would work with all of them, but this has not materialized. Now, we have to be more specific and that is why I am speaking against this policy statement.

People have to understand that the one group that we have worked with, as the CLC, has been the CUS in Nicaragua, which is a very small organization, and does not represent the vast majority of workers in Nicaragua, and we are ignoring the rest. It would be like having people in another country recognize a trade union central in Canada of about 2,000 members and ignore this body, the CLC. That is basically what we are doing in Nicaragua, and we have to get our act straight there.

Another thing that bothered me recently was the article in *Canadian Labour* which concerned the Amnesty International report. The article was very confusing, and what it did was mix up the crimes of the Contras with some of the charges against the government. The charges against the government were fairly simple, sometimes detaining people for a few days or maybe a week and letting them go, that type of charge. The very same article referred to rapes, the disappearances, people being dragged out of their homes and people being murdered. For anyone who does not understand the political situation in Nicaragua, I am convinced that they would be totally confused, and they would think that it is the Nicaraguan government which was responsible for all of these crimes. I hope that we are not printing those articles so that we can justify not taking the type of action that we should be taking in Nicaragua. I hope that is not the intention.

What I find about this whole policy paper is that it just does not recognize the representative groups in the country. It is high time that our International Affairs Department starts to listen to the delegates when they send resolutions to a Convention like this. The resolutions are very specific with respect to developing ties and working with the other major trade union centrals. Even though we have said that at past conventions, it is still not happening. We really have to take a serious look at this question and, hopefully, the International Affairs Department from here on will be developing their programs in line with the wishes of the delegates who come to Convention.

MR. D. WERLIN (President, AFL): I can remember coming to Canadian Labour Congress Conventions when International Affairs reports were full of absolutely nothing but cold war rhetoric. As somebody who has been active in the peace movement all my life, I want to tell you that we have come a long way when we are able to deal with the kind of questions that are now before this Convention. However, I also believe that we have quite a long way to go before we really fully express the interest of Canadian workers. The remarks being made about how we support the ANC and SACTU and the lack of recognition in this document, and in a number of other documents which have been discussed in the CLC Executive Council and to which I have addressed myself in that forum, are based on some kind of reluctance to support those organizations which are trying, it seems to me, to fundamentally change the society of countries like Nicaragua and South Africa. We have to start calling a spade a spade, and we have to start taking our direction from the people in those countries who are fighting for their liberation and fighting against the kinds of regimes that have been suppressing them for so long.

I want to address my remarks primarily to the question of the arms race and its effect on Canadian working people. I want to suggest that the main reason for the hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers in this country is the madness of the arms race to which we are attached across the border with the United States. We have many studies which show that the billions of dollars invested in armaments produce far fewer jobs than the same amount of investment in construction, education, health care, etc. that our government is cutting back on. In the Wilson budget that was recently brought in, every single department of government was cut back, and hundreds of thousands of workers are losing their jobs as a result of it. The only department in which there was no cutback was in the Department of National Defence. That money is not being spent in defending Canada; that money is being transferred from the pockets of the workers to the bank accounts of the multinational corporations that are producing cruise missiles and nuclear weapons and all kinds of military hardware that is the root cause of the destabilization and the tremendously dangerous situation that this world is in.

In the meantime, the very infrastructure of this country and of the United States is deteriorating. The Canadian Federation of Municipalities estimates that it would require $12 billion just to bring our roads, bridges, railways, sewers, waterworks and transit systems up to the level that they ought to be, and put back into a decent state of repair. The expenditure of money in that direction would create hundreds of thousands of jobs, and would virtually solve the unemployment problem in this country; but instead of that, they are funneling that money into the arms race, simply because it is a super profit place for the multinational corporations. This document should state that more clearly.

In closing, I think the delegates to this Convention should know — and this document does not tell them — that the Canadian Labour Congress has now helped to organize the Canadian Peace Alliance and has joined it and is going to have a member on its steering committee, and it should be telling the trade union movement that that is the direction we should be going in at the Federation, Labour Council, and local union levels as well. This document should be strengthened to include those kinds of references.

MR. J. GUILD (Halifax, Dartmouth and District L.C.): While I agree with many of the sentiments in this report, our brothers and sisters around the world are in danger and need more than just our good intentions. They need active support.

I shall focus my remarks on Nicaragua. In 1984, I visited Nicaragua on an OXFAM study tour. Two Nova Scotians took us to factories, hospitals, co-op and state farms and newspaper offices. In all aspects of Nicaraguan life, trade unonists are in the forefront. Seven years ago, under Somoza, trade unionists were rare, underground or on the run, if not already in prison.

The Agricultural Workers' Union has organized thousands of workers so that, now, they have better wages, working conditions and guaranteed room and board. Before, they lived in misery, as migrant labourers with no rights, just moving from farm to farm. Many of these workers are women, and the union is working hard to make it easier for them to participate in the running of their own union. They are holding meetings at more convenient times, and they are working on audio-visual presentations, so the workers from one area can hear and see what their sisters are doing in other areas.

In the hospitals, nurses, cleaning and kitchen staff and doctors are all in the same union, and are working together to provide

the best service to Nicaragua, to people who had never seen the inside of a hospital before, because they could not afford the fees.

In a textile factory, and a dairy, we happened to arrive when mass meetings of the workers were discussing the latest government economic plan. I could not help but be impressed by how they grasped the issue, and by their convictions that their efforts can make a difference on how their country is run. All these unions are affiliated to the CST, the largest trade union central in Nicaragua. I was certainly heartened to see that they have good unions in that country, because it is one country where we will not lose jobs from plants and mills closing in Canada to set up in Nicaragua. As long as those unions are strong, then the differences between he working conditions and labour costs there will not be as great as they are here.

We also talked to the executive of CUS, a trade union central which goes back to the days of the dictator, Somoza, and now represents less than 2,000 workers. They told us how the Nicaraguan government was not working in the interests of working people, and, amazingly, did not condemn the murderous tactics of the Contras.

On my return to Halifax, I was happy to see that members of the Labour Council were interested in what was going on in Nicaragua. With other unionists who had visited Nicaragua, we held a benefit dance for the Tools-for-Peace project, and raised several hundred dollars to help send material aid to Nicaragua.

We worked with community groups, peace groups, etc. who were doing solidarity work. This did a lot of good for the labour movement. Others in the community saw us as people who cared about social justice, not only in Halifax, not only in Canada, but internationally.

Now, they are the people we need to help us spread the word about the dangers of free trade, privatization, and deregulation. However, when the CLC does not support a majority trade union, such as CST, and instead provides funding to CUS, which is seen as undermining the progress of justice in Nicaragua, we lose a lot of credibility with these friends. We in the CLC should call on the Canadian government to follow a foreign policy made in Canada, and not just be an obliging little puppy dog following Reagan's trail. Similarly, the CLC must be equally alert to the dangers of following a made-in-the-U.S.A. policy in international affairs by trade unions.

The international solidarity work done by local unions, labour councils and hundreds of individual trade unionists across Canada must be reflected in the official CLC policy. This statement falls far short of this. The Canadian Labour Congress needs to respond much more forcefully to the urgent needs of workers in Central America and other countries in the world. Believe me, the rank-and-file will support strong measures to help workers around the world fight for the dignity and justice they deserve.

MR. L. EMBREE (B.C. Council of Carpenters): I would like to compliment the Committee on their condemnation of Reagan and his administration and their position of support for the Contras. I had the opportunity to return to Nicaragua in May of last year for the inaugural opening of the Carpenters' Training School. It became very obvious to me — and I think it is obvious to most people in this hall — that there is a full-blown war going on in that country; it is not brush fires and isolated incidents, but a full-fledged war.

As far as the report is concerned, unfortunately there are some glaring omissions in regard to solidarity work going on with unions in this organization and across the country. The Carpenters' Union in B.C. has had a training school functioning in Nicaragua for the last two years. We had a brother and sister volunteer their labour for six months and eight months respectively, last year, to teach in this particular school. The Fishermen's Union is in the process, at this particular time, of using the Carpenters' project as a prototype in establishing a similar project in Rivas, in the Southern part of Nicaragua. The Tools-for-Peace campaign has become national in scope across this country.

There is still no word on the 27 missing trade unionists in Guatemala. The Guatemalan government is trying to put on a new social democratic face to the rest of the world, and the Congress should have taken the opportunity to force that government to investigate the disappearance of those 27 trade unionists.

The report is blatant in its lack of recognition on these particular issues, and the work that is being done, and the support of this work being done in unions across Canada. These particular solidarity groups, at least in my experience, cross all community lines. They are the groups that have allowed the trade union organizations and trade unions in those communities to harness non-traditional support in our fight-back against Bennett and his bandits in B.C.

Across the country, taking into consideration the remarks of some of the executive officers and delegates earlier at this Convention, we are going to need to harness all of our support to fight the free trade issue. It is imperative that we use those particular committees, and I am sure those committees will respond.

There have been resolutions from every province across this country into this Convention pointing out the direction in which the Congress should go in regards to Central America. I think the report fails to do that, and, on that basis, it is unacceptable.

CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Mercier): I allowed you to speak on a pro mike, because that is how you started out, and you ended telling us that the report was unacceptable. If you are not in favour of the report, I would ask that you go to the con mikes; if you are in favour of the report, go to the pro mikes.

The question is being called. I have a tremendous list of speakers, but I also have a problem in that we have now reached the time of adjournment for today's business. I would like to suggest that those who wish to speak stay at the microphones, and I will ask my staff to go down and take your names. When we bring the Committee back, you will go back into your lineup as you are now. We have done this before on very important questions, and, if that is agreeable, I shall now call the adjournment of the Convention.

The Convention adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1986
Morning session

Secretary-Treasurer Shirley Carr called the convention to order at 9:30 a.m.

MS. M. GRIFFITHS (ACTRA): A point of personal privilege. I do not know if all the brothers and sisters at the Convention are aware of May Works, the celebration of the rich cultural life that exists in the labour movement. May Works have a lot of different events and you can find out about them by picking up one of these brochures at the booth just outside the hall. It describes many of the varied events available throughout Toronto within easy access of the Convention. They have free programs in their Hospitality Suite in L'Hotel today and tomorrow at noon and 4:30. May Works is the result of a lot of hard work by the cultural workers of this country. Please come and share with us.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you sister. Is this a point of order?

MS. F. RENGER (PSAC-National Component): Point of privilege. Much has been said over the last few days about how we must fight free trade, privatization and deregulation and I am confident that much more will be committed to that struggle over the next three days.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Sister, a point of privilege is a personal point not on the discussions that we have had or Convention policies.

MS. F. RENGER (PSAC-Natinoal Component): Okay. For that reason, I do not want to be justly accused of not practising what we preach. I suggest that all those in attendance not use the made-in-the-U.S.A. Shaeffer pen which they received in the Convention kit. The pens are packaged in Canada, but I am sure that everyone here will agree . . .

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): That is not a point of personal privilege. I am sorry, I am going to call upon the Credentials Committee.

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

MR. I. REILLY (Credentials Committee Chairperson): The April 30th report of the Credentials Committee:

Fraternal delegates	3
ICFTU representative	1
Congress Officers	4
Representatives of affiliated unions	98
Officers and delegates from Federations of Labour and Labour Councils	107
Representatives of affiliated organizations	2,623
Representatives of directly chartered unions	8
TOTAL	2,844

I move the adoption of this report; seconded by L. Nicholson, Committee Secretary.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The third report of the Credentials Committee has been moved and seconded. Anyone on the question? All those in favour of adopting the Credentials Committee Report? Any opposed. The motion is carried

I would ask Brother Bob While if he would go through the agenda for today's session.

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW): The Executive Council this morning has proposed the following agenda: We are going to return immediately to the International Affairs policy paper that was being discussed yesterday afternoon and then we are going to move in to the Report of the International Affairs Committee. Following that, at approximately 10:30, the Report of the Committee on Constitution and Laws, document no. 1; and then, at approximately 11:15, the Report of the Committee on Occupational Health and Safety, document no. 10. The agenda for the afternoon will include the Report of the Committee on Social Action and Services, at 3:45. This evening we plan to have on the agenda the Tech Change Committee Report, document no. 11, and depending on the timetable, we may have the General Resolutions Committee, document no. 5, return.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We indicated last night, when we adjourned, that we would take down the microphone numbers and the speakers at the microphone. At the time there were 46 speakers standing at the microphone on document no. 20. I shall take them in rotation as I have received them, and if you are not at the microphone, then you have missed your turn.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS POLICY STATEMENT

MR. R. CHANDLER (PSAC-UPCE): This document does an adequate job of covering all of the various issues around the world and the various struggles that workers are working in, in many parts of the world. There may be a few problems with the document, in that it should have stressed a little more the need for some action, in terms of helping to support these various struggles. I was recently on a union tour of Central America and I know that struggles that are outlined inside this policy paper. I support the things that the policy paper has brought forward in calling for dialogue with the FDR-FMLN in El Salvador and condemning U.S. aggression in Nicaragua, but the one thing I we need is more action and I hope that perhaps we will see some more action in the next couple of years.

MR. D. WILSON (CWC): The policy paper is excellent. I also was recently in Central America and I realized the problems that workers in that particular region have. They face the possibility of dying simply for being a member of a union, for being a supporter of the union. This is a day-to-day occurrence in that region of the world and I really wish you would support this paper and I hope that you do.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): There is a point of order.

MR. B. WEISLEDGER (NUPGE-OPSEU): My point of order is that yesterday in the debate, you went to all microphones except three and four and it seems to me you ought to start there before you go anywhere else today.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, I have 46 speakers and I am trying to be just as fair as I can. I will go from pro to con, pro, con, all the way down the list. Impartial people watch the microphones. We will now go on.

MR. G. LARTER (CWC): I am a member of the SACTU Solidarity Committee of Canada. I rise at a con mike because this paper does not accurately reflect the unity of the struggle that exists in South Africa today. it does not accurately reflect the two levels of struggle that are carried out in that country. The aboveground, which is COSATU, has been spoken of, but the underground trade union movement, SACTU, has not been spoken of and the work of the SACTU Solidarity Committee which raises support for the SACTU, has not been mentioned. COSATU's message was very clear yesterday; there is no competition between SACTU and COSATU. The ANC, SACTU, COSATU, and UDP are all struggling today in South Africa for a free and democratic South Africa. COSATU is an independent organization and it sets its own policies but, in terms of its founding principles, it accepted SACTU's program and that was non-racial trade unionism, organize the unorganized, one industry, one union and most importantly, political trade unionism.

When it comes to SACTU, we talk about its historical significance. I and Pat Clancy, of the UAW, traveled to Southern Africa and I can tell you that SACTU is making history today. At this moment, while I speak at this microphone, they are doing things that COSATU, the above-ground trade union movement, cannot do. They are organizing the strikes, they are organizing the industrial sabotage, they are organizing the stay-aways, they are organizing other people to organize that work. They are organizing things that, if members of COSATU were caught doing, they would be charged under the Terrorism Act and likely put in prison for life. And they are doing it in a way that is invisible, so that when people come back from South Africa, they can say they did not see SACTU.

That is a compliment to the work of the organization of SACTU. They are doing it in a way that is invisible and to do that, it takes money and it takes political support. The SACTU Solidarity Committee of Canada is doing that work today. They are raising political support and they are raising money, and when this paper refers to that committee as an anti-apartheid committee with a labour focus, that quite frankly is an insult. Because what does anti-apartheid mean? I understand that Holiday Inn is anti-apartheid, I understand that Xerox of Canada is anti-apartheid, but they cannot continue to profit by apartheid. This Committee has been mandated, by the National Executive Committee of SACTU and has the support of all the peoples organizations in South Africa: the UDF, the ANC and COSATU. We are also supported by such unions as UAW, CWC, PSAC, CUPE, CUPW, Longshoremen, CBRT, CPU, UE, SEIU, UFAWU, the Alberta Federation of Labour, the Ontario Federation of Labour. We have a very special work to do for the trade union movement and we have done that work. Some $200,000, since 1980, has been raised for that underground struggle. There are 280 individual labour bodies that have contributed to the SACTU strike fund; there are some 70 sustainers. More importantly, the educational work is being done. There was a day of action in

March when workers in airlines and telephone and in the post office took action against apartheid. Jay Naidoo, the General Secretary of COSATU, told us that it is extremely important.

South Africa is on fire and we, the trade union movement, have an obligation to support not only the above ground trade union movement, but also the underground trade union movement if that struggle is to succeed in a way that we want it to succeed and result in freedom now.

MS. K. McGOVERN (CUPE): I think it is very significant that all the people who have been on these microphones, whether they were on the pro or con, are supporting many of the parts of this, but rather critical in how they have been presented. In terms of solidarity, for example, I had some observations that, while it was important to cover many parts of the world that were discussed, it was not done in the proper way, as was well outlined by previous speakers. I think that that is important, because when we are talking about the struggle for food, clothing, shelter, education, work and peace, we have to recognize, as the representatives of the Canadian working people, who are the people working for these around the world in the various struggles. I do not believe that that has been done adequately in this paper, so while I am in favour of the thrust, I am not in favour of how it was presented in many sections.

So, I am here because I wanted to speak about peace — and this is my first Convention, and I read many times about the wonderful positions that the Canadian Labour Congress had taken in favour of peace. But when I read this document and when I saw the videotape, I saw the concern, but I saw a concern that was not focused. Again, I was in favour but I felt that there were a lot of things lacking. For example, you mentioned in the document Amnesty International and Operation Dismantle, through its spokesperson James Stark. What was not mentioned was the Canadian caravan; what was not mentioned specifically was the Canadian Peace Alliance which you have mentioned we are now going to be working with. I think that that movement representing churches, political tendencies, trade unions, community groups and professional organizations is the widest and the most unified section of the peace movement at this time.

I think that while we are looking at the kind of escalating in weaponry and the kind of tensions that we have been seeing developing, especially through the United States — the country from which I come incidentally — it is really quite frightening. We see peace initiatives being rejected by Reagan, we see a kind of movement towards the so-called surgical strike, which means basically that the President can go in and do what he wants. I see that the need for working around the peace issues is now greater than ever. Subsequently, I applaud that we are in the Canadian Peace Alliance. I hope that the General Resolution 59 is eventually adopted because I think when you put our money and our resources where our ideals are, we have great possibilities in moving forward in this area, which is essential for all of us, because if there is not peace and if we do not direct our money to what our priorities are, then we will not be able to achieve those things that we need, which is in pursuit of human dignity. So I hope somebody comes and urges a referral somewhere along the line, because I think this document can be toughened up quite a bit.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I would like to please remind the delegates going to microphones that if you are in favour of the policy paper, obviously go to the pro mike but do not end up talking as if your should be at the con mike.

MS. P. MAY (CUPE): I had the good fortune of being able last February to go to Nicaragua and El Salvador. As the previous speaker said, there are many things in this report I can support. However, I feel that it does not go far enough. I have stood here for two days and I have listened to how we must distinguish ourselves from the Americans and yet, I met with unions in both El Salvador and Nicaragua that were supported directly by the Americans and I also met in refugee camps where I saw what the Americans were doing. Again, as the previous speaker said, I hope at some point this will be referred back because it could do good things.

MR. B. WEISLEDER (NUPGE-OPSEU): I want to speak to the positive aspects of this resolution and try to urge the strengthening of some other aspects. The resolution addresses the potential of devestating war that could destroy humanity. I want to talk about a real war that is now raging In Central America. There is war in El Salvador where the Duarte regime is bombing its own population in the country-side.

There is war in Guatemala where, despite elections, thousands of Guatemalans remain imprisoned, have disappeared and are victims of state repression.

There is war in Honduras, where the United States and mercenary troops actually outnumber the armed forces of that country. A Canadian priest was recently killed by mercenary thugs in Honduras.

And, of course, there is war against the sovereign people and government of Nicaragua where they have suffered over 14,000 casualties since overthrowing the hated Somoza dictatorship in 1979; on a scale comparable to the Canadian population, that would be equivalent to over a 100,000 people killed.

There is war in Central America and we know that this war is made in the U.S.A. but we have no reason to be smug. The Canadian government is guilty of silent complicity in Washington's dirty war in Central America, through Canadian aid to the regime in El Salvador and a contemplated resumption of aid to the regime in Guatemala, through NATO war manoeuvres in the Caribbean and by being one of a total of four countries in the whole world to support the barbaric U.S. bombing attack on Libya, which is clearly in aid of the U.S. war drive against Central America. The Canadian government has demonstrated all too clearly exactly where it stands on foreign policy questions.

Brian loves Ronnie, and Ronnie loves Rambo. Mulroney plays the soft cop to the Rambo maniacs who will make their day by shooting up Nicaraguan peasants; and the banks and corporations, Canadian and American, continue to plunder. So the question confronting us as a Labour Congress is: how are we going to stop this war? Not simply by lobbying the Canadian government, certainly not by piously hoping that Canada's foreign policy in the words of the document before us "will reflect Canadian values", because the values of corporate Canada, the values of Tory Canada are already too well reflected in the Canadian government complicity with U.S. imperialism in Central America. To break Canada from Reagan's war drive and to stop the war in Central America will require a mass movement, a movement of hundreds of thousands of people, a movement like the one that helped us stop the war in Vietnam a little over a decade ago.

The International Affairs paper speaks fairly well in terms of policy, but not so well in terms of action. On June 14, in Toronto, there will be a mass demonstration against the United States' intervention in Central America. There will be similar demonstrations in June in Montreal, Ottawa, and other cities across the country. But there is all too little co-ordination and organization of this new anti-war movement. Unfortunately, the peace and disarmament movements do not address the question of building a movement against the war in Central America as yet, but the CLC could play a decisive role in linking together union activists who are doing international solidarity and anti-war work, in providing material and organizational assistance, in providing the kind of national anti-intervention protest that we need to have a big political impact. That, in my view, is the kind of CLC International Affairs Department that we need: a mass action perspective to stop a war that is actually occurring now, raging across Central America. So I appeal to you, brothers and sisters, to

strengthen this document so that we can take a lesson from the 1960s and 1970s. Let us do it now, let us do it for the sake of peace and social justice in Central America.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called. I am going to test the house. All those in favour of the question? Hands down. Any opposed? It is being carried to put the question by a considerably large amount of showing of hands.

All those in favour of the Committee's concurrence in document no.20, "International Affairs and the Pursuit of Human Dignity: A Canadian Labour Response", please show your hands. Hands down. Any opposed? The document is carried.

MR. L. HARRISON (UAW, Canada): Just a point, Madam Chairperson. We just got $400. worth of crafts sent in from Chile from some political prisoners down there, that use the money to feed themselves in the jails of Santiago. They are out in one of the booths over here and any money you spend there will be sent back down to those political prisoners in Chile, I am talking about local union leadership, the type that is on the floor here today, so if you can help us out by going over to the booth and purchasing some, I would appreciate it.

MR. H. COHEN (ATU): Can I have a point of information, Madam Chairperson? I would like somebody on the committee, whoever is responsible for telling us this morning that document no. 11 is being referred until tonight's session, because I am confused. All we are hearing about for two days, with all due respect to the poor people and the unfortunate people in South Africa and these unfortunate countries, is the situation in other countries. It is about time we dealt with matters dealing with Canada. We have here a Constitution to be dealt with. Let us get our own house in order first. We have got problems that the CLC Constitution needs addressing and needs changing. Here document no. 11 is being referred until tonight, when you will have maybe one third of the people here. I do not think that this is right.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I will ask Brother White to respond to that.

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW, Canada): At adjournment yesterday, there were 46 speakers wanting to speak on the International Affairs document and obviously we only had had a half hour's discussion on it. It was the Executive Council this morning who thought, because we were having a night session, that we should continue the International Affairs debate this morning rather than interrupt that, and give the Committee on Organization the full time to report, immediately upon commencing the session this evening. It is not taking anything away from the Report of the Committee on Organization. The night session is just as important as the morning session as long as everybody shows up.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you. Chairperson of the Committee.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MR. G. DOCQUIER (International Affairs Committee Chairperson): We will be dealing with document 8.

MR. R. SMITH (International Affairs Committee Secretary): The International Affairs Committee considered resolutions IA-1 to IA-78 inclusive, resolution G-56 and the Policy Statement "International Affairs and the Pursuit of Human Dignity: A Canadian Labour Response", referred to it by the Executive Council.

Resolutions IA-1, IA-17, IA-28, IA-32, IA-39, IA-43, IA-47, IA-49, IA-50, IA-56, IA-59, and IA-68 are composited in the substitute resolution on South Africa:

"WHEREAS the repressive Government of South Africa continues to brutally impose its racist policies of apartheid on the people of South Africa, denying them fundamental freedoms and a society based on majority rule, and continues to illegally occupy Namibia, uses force to destabilize neighbouring countries such as Angola, Mozambique and Lesotho; and

"WHEREAS the people of South Africa are increasing their heroic resistance in all sectors of society as witnessed by the formation of COSATU, and have called for assistance and sanctions against the regime;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress reaffirm its condemnation of apartheid, with its iniquitous Pass Laws, and the shameful imprisonment of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC and its affiliates reaffirm and vow to increase support for and solidarity with the political and trade union organizations committed to the creation of a democratic and non-racial South Africa, and with the Canadian workers who refuse to handle, produce, dispatch or use in any way goods from or destined to South Africa; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC call on the Canadian government to impose comprehensive political, social, and economic sanctions against South Africa, commencing with a ban on investments in South Africa and Namibia, and to take action at the Commonwealth, the United Nations and its specialized agencies, to join with other countries in beating apartheid."

I move adoption; seconded by G. Docquier.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Concurrence has been moved and seconded with the substitute resolution concerning the resolutions listed.

MS. B. WALL (NUPGE-OPSEU): I am a member of the SACTU Solidarity Committee. I rise in support of this resolution and I want to make sure that some strong points are made, which come from the other resolutions which formed this one. I just want to reiterate those strong points so that the delegates here know what this resolution is to reflect.

We heard from Brother Jay Naidoo of COSATU. I want to refer to the unity that he talked about between the above-ground struggle, as represented by COSATU, the Congress of South African Trade Unions, and the underground struggle, by SACTU. We should reflect those principles of unity in any documents that we put forward. This resolution speaks to the question of supporting the legitimate organizations: we should name them. It speaks to the question of sanctions: we should talk about Canadian workers taking sanction actions because that is what we have already done in this country. I think that we should make it quite clear that this body is our body. We come here with all of the resolutions: 46 resolutions were put forward on this question, 46 resolutions which clearly spelled out the support for COSATU, SACTU, ANC, UDF. And that is what we support; that is what we, the delegates here, have supported in our actions against apartheid at the workplace.

I was privileged to be part of my own union campaign, to be seconded from my job for six weeks to work on a special campaign to remove South African products from the workplace. Do not just call on the Canadian government. We should call workers to action on the sanction question and that is what trade unionists throughout this country have been doing for the past several years. They have also been showing their financial, educational, political, solidarity and we should make sure that we continue to do that. The resolution points that way, but we know that we are the people who are taking the actions and we must continue doing that. In terms of supporting of the unions in South Africa, Congress policy should be clearly stated. A letter to Jean-Claude Parrot (CUPW President), recently from CLC President Dennis McDermott, spelled out that Canadian Labour Congress believes strongly that we have an obligation to work with SACTU, ANC and the emerging non-racial unions in South Africa, and that we will continue our efforts towards those goals. Let us

just not make the statements, let us make sure it is reflected in our documents and reflected in our action.

We, in Canada, through the SACTU Solidarity Committee, through the other support groups to Central America, we, the unions represented here, are taking the actions and will continue to take those actions. We are the ones who are raising financial solidarity. It is not just a question of handling over a cheque, but the question of education of our members. In the SACTU Solidarity Committee, there are some 10,000 members a year that we address and we make sure that we clarify the question of unity, the necessity of supporting the above-ground and the underground levels of struggle in South Africa. We do not just talk about the historical role of SACTU, we talk about SACTU as it lives in the lives of people of South Africa today. We, in this labour movement, in our unions, our members, we commit ourselves to continuing to push for the principle, solidarity with COSATU and SACTU, that is both forms of the struggle, in terms of our actions at the workplace, until that regime is defeated; and all of this based on the principle that an injury to one is an injury to all.

MR. W. MUNDLE (CUPW): I want to speak in favour of the resolution and particularly where we talk about increasing support for the people who are doing solidarity work with the political and the trade union organizations. I am going to speak in favour, even though we are not naming the organizations as I would like, and I am particularly referring to the SACTU Solidarity Committee in Canada.

I have been involved in the union for a number of years and I have seen various CLC people in the field talking from time to time about international affairs, but always reluctant to recognize the existence of this Committee. I know, within my own union, the work that they have done and how they have educated and elevated the level of awareness of our membership to understand what is going on in South Africa, and I could never understand why the CLC would not work in conjunction with these people on a more consistent basis. I am supporting this resolution, based on what I heard in the previous document. Most speakers that were up were saying the same thing, they want us to work in conjunction with the SACTU Solidarity Committee in Canada. When we refer to groups that we are going to work with, I am supporting this on the basis that, from here on, that is one of the groups that we are talking about and that we finally get our heads out of the sand and recognize the work that they have down over the years, and that they are going to be here for a long time to come, because of the support that they have from the other affiliates of the CLC.

MS. B. BYERS (NUPGE-SGEU): I support this resolution and hope that the delegates here will strongly support the resolution, so we can get on with our work, our solidarity work with COSATU and with SACTU. Our work in our unions and in our communities is having an effect on most corporations and governments who insist on dealing with the racist government in South Africa. Recently, when I was in the U.S.A., I picked up an article on one of their newspapers that indicated that there is a surging number of shareholder-sponsored resolutions calling for social and political action and that the majority of those resolutions have to deal with the situation in South Africa. They say that the major difference this year is the big presence of the pension funds pushing companies to sign the Sullivan principles, which are guidelines on corporate behaviour in South Africa devised by the Reverend Leon Sullivan of Philadelphia. The shareholder resolution is increasingly useful as a tool because a number of institutional investors are taking them seriously. The city of San Francisco has a resolution that no more than $5,000 can be invested in any company that deals with South Africa. Every time that resolution was discussed on the radio, they not only discussed the investments, they continued to deal with the question of racism in South Africa. We got two shots at the issue every time it came up.

There will continue to be governments, the Canadian government and provincial governments, who insist on dealing with South Africa. In Saskatchewan, Premier Devine says that he will not take South African wines off Liquor Board shelves. We have continually asked him not to put our Liquor Board workers in the crisis of conscience when they have to deal with that material. Premier Devine says that individuals in Saskatchewan should use their conscience and not buy South African wine. We would say to him that he should use his conscience, if he has one, and not stock South African wines.

We have a responsibility in the labour movement to work towards eliminating racism in our own country and in other countries. We have a responsibility to work with all of the organizations, COSATU and SACTU, in making sure that we reach our goals.

MR. K. CLAVETTE (Ottawa and District L.C.): I rise in support of this resolution primarily because it includes the Labour Council Resolution 32. In particular, we called for support of SACTU and the ending of diplomatic relations with South Africa. This does not come out specifically in this resolution but I think the intent is there.

I would like to address the controversy going around the country right now being disguised as a case of freedom of speech, and I speak about the ambassador from South Africa, Baab, who wants to use Canada as his forum, his platform, to produce, to spout the hatred, the vileness of the apartheid regime of South Africa. The Labour Council takes the view that it is not a question of free speech. If Canadians wants to get up and debate among themselves, we will do that; such as the right-wing business leaders who wish to continue doing business in South Africa. We do not believe that we should have diplomatic relations with the regime of South Africa.

There is nothing worse than the inheritance of the facist regimes in Europe during the 30s, regimes that oppressed the people, that killed the workers for the most obscene reason: because of their race. We reject this in Canada; we should reject the ambassador of South Africa, we should not have diplomatic relations. This resolution calls for political sanctions. Let the first one be the ending of diplomatic relations in South Africa, let us take action on this resolution. SACTU, COSATU, the trade unionists that I have had the pleasure of meeting, thanks to the International Affairs Department, the brothers and sisters visiting us from COSATU, from the mine workers, have called for this kind of action. They face repression in their own country if they call for economic sanctions or any sanction. They face repression for just the basic political rights that we have. They do not have them. They are oppressed and killed for trade union rights.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you. I am going to test the house on this resolution. All those in favour of my putting the question to the house. Down. Opposed. It is carried.

I will now put the question of concurrence in the resolution as indicated by the Chairperson. All those in favour of adoption. Hands down. Any opposed. Motion is carried. Thank you.

MR. D. COLLINS (International Affairs Committee Member): Resolutions IA-2, IA-11, IA-24, IA-26, IA-48 and IA-57 are composited in the substitute resolution on Central America:

"WHEREAS the underlying causes of the conflicts in Central America are rooted in repression, injustice, poverty, external dependency and the denial of political participation to millions of people; and

"WHEREAS military escalation in the region has directly increased the suffering and poverty of the people of Central America and has frustrated the goals of essential and inevitable revolutionary change;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this 16th Constitutional Convention of the Canadian Labour Congress reiter-

ate its support for the heroic struggle of Central American workers for 'bread, peace and freedom'; continue to support the right to self-determination of the peoples of the region by advocating full respect for fundamental human and trade union rights; and reaffirm its condemnation of U.S. and other military intervention in Central America, in particular U.S. support for Nicaraguan 'contras'; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Convention recognize the democratic opening in Guatemala, while demanding that all Guatemalans be guaranteed full human rights and civil and political liberties; condemns the continuing activities of right-wing death squads in El Salvador and the failure of the Salvadoran government to resume a constructive dialogue with the FMLN; calls for a resumption of the bilateral talks between the U.S.A. and Nicaragua; reiterates its endorsement of negotiated settlements of the conflicts in the region through the Contadora peace initiatives; and reiterates the support of the CLC for Central American workers and their trade union organizations through fraternal contract and solidarity projects; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC call upon the Government of Canada to: implement policies which will work against intervention and military escalation in the region and favour respect for human rights and economic development; deny bilateral aid to any country serving as a base for military intervention; and actively undertake measures to support the Contadora initiatives for a negotiated settlement in Central America."

I move on behalf of the Committee, seconded by G. Docquier.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Concurrence has been moved in the substitute resolution on Central America.

MR. R. CHANDLER (PSAC-UPCE): I want to rise in support of this resolution and the Committee's recommendation of concurrence. I had the opportunity to be in El Salvador and in Nicaragua last February and I want to talk a bit about some of my experiences in El Salvador. In El Salvador, I had the opportunity to meet with some of the victims of the bombing carried out by the Salvadoran army against its own people in the rural area. People have been forced out of their homes; they have had their homes and all of their possessions destroyed in the Salvadoran army's counter-insurgency campaign.

I had the opportunity to meet with some of the leadership of the Telecommunication Workers, ASTEL. A number of the leaders of that union and family members of the leaders of that union have suffered tremendous repression at the hands of the Salvadoran regime. The two sons of Umberto Santano, one of the leaders, are right at this very moment in Mariono prison in San Salvador, where they have suffered tremendous beatings, torture and they have been drugged. This is the kind of situation we have in El Salvador today. I had the opportunity to meet with members of the executive of the Waterworks' Union and their entire membership was fired in the strike last year, all 250 of them. And it is a little bit different being fired in a place like El Salvador than it is here, because there are absolutely no social benefits whatsoever. That is the kind of situation we have in El Salvador today, where the rural people are suffering the bombings of the Salvadoran regime, where workers' rights are totally denied and where death squads' torture is the norm.

In spite of all of this kind of repression, I also saw one of the largest demonstrations to take place in El Salvador in the past five to six years, where about 50,000 workers marched through the streets of San Salvador under the banner of a new unity confederation, the National Union of Salvadoran Workers; 50,000 people on a Friday morning, during working hours, under conditions of tremendous political repression. I think that we have to start doing a little bit more work to help support these people.

In Nicaragua, I also saw people rebuilding their society under conditions also of a war, perpetrated by the United States, in supporting the contras. I saw houses, health care clinics and schools destroyed by the contras and this is the hand of the Reagan administration. There is a terrible war going on in Central America. I think that we have to do our best to support the people who are struggling for their rights in Central America, and this policy paper is a good step in that direction, but I think we have to do a little bit more.

MR. D. BENEDICT (UAW): I wish to congratulate the Committee for having brought forth this resolution. The essential thing is knowing that the people working for the Canadian Labour Congress will be doing more in the future than they did in the past, in the sense indicated in the resolution. Recently, I was in El Salvador as a member of a peace mission, which received concrete support from the CLC and from my union, the UAW. We met Salvadoran workers struggling for their rights, a struggle which deserves our full support. Although more details could have been included in its resolved sections, the resolution nevertheless deserves our full support.

I presume that many delegates here will want to meet the representative in Canada of one of the most important trade union organizations in El Salvador, namely Arturo Valencia who, until recently, was in prison with other members of the executive committee of the Electrical Workers' Union, the STECEL. Arturo Valencia is here to represent the Central American countries. I shall not take more of your time to repeat what I observed myself as well as what the previous brother at the mike told you.

MR. O. NUNEZ (IBEW-Québec): There is a group of Latin American Canadians attending this Convention, representing various unions. You have introduced several fraternal delegations, some of them coming from South Africa, United States, Great Britain, Barbados, Poland, Israel, etc. We welcome them, but we are very disappointed because the CLC leadership did not invite any union leaders from Latin America. And, as you know, several national liberation struggles are taking place in Latin America. The trade movement is playing a very important role in the struggle for democracy, social justice and peace. That is why we have to criticize the CLC leadership for not having invited any labour leaders from Latin America.

I would like the International Affairs Committee to return with the resolution on Chile before the Convention adjourns. We have at heart this very important cause, as I, myself, come from Chile, and I do hope that you will return with that resolution before the end of the Convention.

Nicaragua is another cause that we have at heart, but, before going any further, I would like to hear the Latin Americans and the Canadians hail the return of the Haitian people to democracy. All of us who are closely watching the events in Nicaragua cannot do otherwise than support, and support most vigorously, the cause of the Nicaraguan people and workers. Great progress has been achieved since 1979 in education, health and employment. This country is struggling for better social conditions for all its citizens, an objective shared here in Canada and in Quebec, from where I come as a union representative. But we worry greatly over the aggressive policy of the American government, over the continuous intervention of the Reagan administration against a small country of 3,000,000 inhabitants. The American government is violating international rights recognized by the United Nations: the right of the people to self-determination, independence and sovereignty. We must all support the cause of the Nicaraguan people, for it is our cause.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I am going to test the house for the question. All those in favour of putting the question, please show your hands. Hands down. Any opposed. The motion is carried.

I am not going to put the question of the Committee's concurrence on the resolution dealing with Central America. All those in favour, please show. Any opposed, please show. Thank you very much. Carried.

I would ask the Committee to step down, but I will be bringing the International Affairs Committee back again. I would ask the Committee on Constitution and Laws to please come forward.

While they are getting ready, I would like to introduce to you Wayne Easter, President of the National Farmers Union, who has been with us for some time. You are welcome, Wayne.

MR. K. CLARK (UFCW): Madam Chairperson, do you have any sense of when the International Affairs Committee will be returning, or has that not been set yet?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): It has not been set yet. We will let you know this afternoon.

Annual Day of Mourning

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I would also like to indicate to you that the office of the Mayor of Hamilton, Ont., has issued a proclamation for the city of Hamilton, honouring our Day of Mourning for those that have been killed or have died on the job.

MR. F. MARCH (NUPGE-NAPE): Sister Carr, I would like to rise on a point of personal privilege.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Go ahead, brother.

MR. F. MARCH (NUGPE-NAPE): I apologize first of all for interrupting debate on this point, but I have to leave this Convention this afternoon and there are some things I would like to say in appreciation for the support we have received from unions in the Canadian Labour Congress itself and some unions outside the Congress, during our dispute in St. John's over the past two months.

It is not inappropriate — not entirely accurate but it is certainly not inappropriate — that you are going to hear a point of privilege over the dispute we have had in the problems of Newfoundland for the past two months, immediately after you have talked about some of the injustices that have been taking place in Third World countries. Because if you look closely at what the ILO did just a few months ago, you would see that the record in this country is certainly not a clean one when it comes to dealing with public sector workers. And that is not only true in the province that I come from, but that is true in every province, at least in four provinces in Canada, and probably in more.

I do not know how I can emphasize this enough, but I want, from the depths of my heart, to thank you and to offer the appreciation of our union, both our provincial union NAPE and our national union, NUPGE, for the tremendous support we have received. Some of that support has been verbal, some of it has been financial and some of it has been a combination of the two. But I want you to know that it is your help and assistance that has encouraged us and given us courage to carry on. Hopefully, the strength that we derive from your help and assistance will help others gain the strength and do what we have done, because I believe, before provincial government workers in this country are going to have absolute and true collective bargaining rights, what happened in the streets of St. John's this month and last month is going to have to happen from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I want you to know that what we started on March 3rd is not finished; what we started on March 3rd is simply the first step in what I suspect is going to be many steps that ultimately will lead to free collective bargaining for all provincial government employees in this country. Before we meet you again, before we sit at another Canadian Labour Congress Convention, we know that some of us, in this delegation right here, are going to have to serve time behind bars. We know that, because of the position that the Newfoundland government has taken, and we may need your support more than ever before when that time comes.

I want to thank the Canadian Labour Congress. I want to thank all the unions, right across this country, who helped us in our hour of need. I want you to know that the battle that is going on in Newfoundland is going to continue until we have the same rights. We understand that the Newfoundland government does not have the same per capita income as the government of Alberta. We understand that, although we would like to get our greedy little mitts on it once in a while, but we are not going to stop until provincial government employees have the same rights in free collective bargaining, which is the unfettered right to strike, just as do other workers in the private and in the public sectors.

I want to thank you for your support, tell you that we are going to need more of it in the future, and let you know that the struggle continues.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We will be there, brother. Thank you very much. Mr. Peckford, I hope you are listening.

I will now call on the Committee Chairperson of the Constitution and Laws Committee.

CONSTITUTION AND LAWS COMMITTEE

MR. R. BASKEN (Constitution and Laws Committee Chairperson): We will be dealing with document no. 1. The Committee will deal with the resolutions in the order on which they appear on the paper. We have met and considered all resolutions C-1 to C-11.

The Committee agreed with the wishes of resolution C-11 but was reluctant to move to 90 days for the cut-off period for resolutions. Instead the Committee felt 75 days should be tried. The Committee therefore moves concurrence in the following substitute resolution:

> "WHEREAS delegates of the Canadian Labour Congress are representing their local unions and should have direction from said unions; and
>
> "WHEREAS it has been shown at other conventions that delegates who come prepared reduce the amount of time spent on debate;
>
> "BE IT RESOLVED that the words '(sixty) 60 calendar days' in Article V, Section 12 (a) be changed to '(seventy-five) 75 calendar days'; and
>
> "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the words '(seven) 7 calendar days' in Article V, Section 12 (d) be changed to '(thirty) 30 calendar days'."

The Committee recommends concurrence as amended in the substitute resolution. I will read Section 12 (a) as amended, so that you get the full gist of the amendment. I will read Section 12 (a) first; and then Section 12 (d). It deals with the subject matter, but there are two parts of the Constitution that are affected.

> *Section 12 (a)* "Except as provided in Sub-section (c) of this Section, all resolutions, petitions, and appeals other than those provided in Section 9 hereof, to be considered by any Convention of the Congress must be received by the Secretary-Treasurer at headquarters in Ottawa, Ontario, seventy-five (75) calendar days immediately preceding the opening of the Convention."
>
> The next part which goes in conjunction with this is *Section (d)*:
>
> "Resolutions, petitions and appeals properly received for consideration by the Convention shall be classified as to nature, contents and subject matter and referred to an appropriate Convention committee, which shall report thereon to the Convention prior to consideration of any such matter by the Convention. No later than thirty (30) calendar days prior to the Convention, copies of resolutions, petitions and appeals in both the English and French languages shall be distri-

buted to the delegates of the Convention for whom credentials have been received thirty (30) calendar days in advance."

The Committee recommends concurrence in the substitute resolution to require resolutions to be in a few days earlier. We believe that that will help and assist in all of the preparations that are necessary for the Convention and that the seven days that is currently in the Constitution is unrealistic in terms of getting anything to the delegates.

Our recommendation is concurrence in the substitute resolution. On behalf of the Committee, I so move, seconded by Secretary Louis Laberge.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence in the substitute resolution. Is there anyone at these microphones who wishes to speak on this one? I will put the question. All those in favour, it takes two-thirds vote please. Hands down. Anyone opposed. It is carried.

MR. R. BASKEN (Constitution and Laws Committee Chairperson): Next, we will deal with resolution no. C-1. I will ask confrère Laberge to read the resolution.

MR. L. LABERGE (Constitution and Laws Committee Secretary): Resolutions C-1 and C-7 both deal with the same subject. This matter was examined very thoroughly when the Commission on Constitution and Structure held hearings across Canada. It was rejected then because of the problem in Canada with the existence of competing union centres. The Committee therefore moves non-concurrence in resolutions C-1 and C-7.

"BE IT RESOLVED that Article IV, Section 3 be amended to reflect the following: (to be added after the second sentence) No affiliate shall affiliate or otherwise agree to assist to affiliate, any local union, branches or lodges of any other affiliate, who has left that affiliate's organization and thus this Congress or other subordinate bodies, due to any internal or external raid by non-affiliates of this Congress, until a period of 5 years has elapsed from the change in certification as ordered by the appropriate labour board; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, in any event, written consent must be obtained from the affiliate that they no longer wish to exercise their established collective bargaining jurisdiction concerning any local union, branches or lodges who have left that affiliate's organization and thus this Congress due to any internal or external raid by non-affiliates of this Congress."

On behalf of the Committee, I so move, seconded by Chairperson R. Basken.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee's recommendation dealing with resolutions C-1 and C-7 is of non-concurrence. Any speakers?

MR. R. BASKEN (Constitution and Laws Committee Chairperson): The Committee moved non-concurrence because of the concern that we had that we have a relatively confusing and difficult group of labour centres, or at least some of them think they are labour centres, in the country. We had that matter extensively discussed when the Commission on Constitution went across the country, and the feeling was that, to be fair, we must not put restrictions that would handcuff the affiliates of the Congress, but leave people like the CNTU, the CCU and the CSD open to do things that the Congress affiliates could not. We encourage your support for the Committee's recommendation of non-concurrence.

MR. R. SAARINEN (ATU): I am here on behalf of Local 1182, Guelph, Ontario. I am a recently appointed international representative for the Amalgamated Transit Union. I was previously the President of the National Canadian Regional Conference of the Amalgamated Transit Union. Our locals in Canada have been, from time to time, subjected to raids. I am not going to go into detail about the organizations who have attempted to raid our organization; however, I think it is very important that we support these particular resolutions put in by our sister locals in Edmonton and Calgary. I do not think that there is any confusion about Article IV and Section 3 and Section 4 of our Constitution, and I think it is very important that this organization have peace and unity within. We cannot have peace and unity within this organization if we, in fact, do not prevent raiding from within. It is very important, if we are going to continue to make this a growing organization, that we work together and respect the integrity of all of the affiliates; and that is the purpose of the resolutions that were put in by our locals and we cannot go along with the non-concurrence.

MR. H. COHEN (ATU): I too am opposed to the recommendation by the Committee of non-concurrence. The Committee talks about it being rejected because of the reasons of competing union centres. I respectfully suggest to the Committee that that is a cop-out. These resolutions were submitted to the CLC, not to the CNTU, not the CCU. We are here to get our house in order. And I refer, if you will allow me a moment, to Article IV, Section 3, where it states: "No affiliate shall organize or attempt to represent employees as to whom an established collective bargaining relationship exists with any other affiliate, or otherwise seek to disrupt or disturb such relationship."

What we do best here in Canada, to my knowledge, in the 28 years I have lived here, is self-destruct. We are like a bunch of cannibals, feeding off one another, raiding. Instead of going out there and organizing the unorganized, we raid one another, allow them into the House of Labour through the back door which then gives them security and safety on the Section 3 of Article IV. And all we are saying to you, Sister Chairperson, is that the Committee should at least realize what these resolutions are all about. We are asking that they not be allowed to affiliate to the CLC after raiding for at least five years; and I would hope that somebody would stand up to a microphone and refer it back to the Committee and ask them to change their decision of non-concurrence to that of concurrence.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother Laberge, you wish to speak, you asked for the mike on this one?

MR. L. LABERGE (Committee Secretary): We do understand, by the way, the meaning of those resolutions. We wholeheartedly agree with the principle that we are to organize the non-organized and we cannot but denounce any plans, any funds put aside for raiding the affiliates of the Canadian Labour Congress. We wholeheartedly agree with the principles of the two resolutions. However, we live in a competitive world and while you were not talking about the CNTU in the resolutions, we have to live with that in Québec, sometimes quite often, and having to wait five years for a union could mean that we would be losing them entirely in the CLC, to the benefit of the CSD, the CNTU, the Canadian Football League, and all the others. This is what it is all about. We have to be realistic, and while we condemn raiding; on the other hand, we have to live in the real world.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I am going to call the question. Well, then I will test the House. Are you ready for the question to be put? All right. Did you wish to speak on it?

MR. A.B. BRUCKNER (ATU): I move that the resolution be referred back to the Committee with the instructions to come back with concurrence in Resolution C-1.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): There has been a motion to refer back. There is no debate on it, but do I have a seconder? It has been seconded. I will put the question. All those in favour of a referral back, please show your hands. Hands down. Those opposed to the referral back. Motion is lost. The referral back is lost.

I will now put the question. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of non-concurrence, please show your hands. Hands down. Those opposed, please show. Hands down. The motion is carried.

MR. R. BASKEN (Constitution and Laws Committee Chairperson): Resolution no. C-2, which is similar to C-4, C-8 and C-9.

They all deal with the issue of affiliation of locals to federations and labour councils. The Committee moves non-concurrence in resolutions C-2, C-4 and C-8. Resolution C-9 asks for no change and would be covered in principle by the previous motion of non-concurrence; seconded by L. Laberge.

The Committee recommends non-concurrence and on behalf of the Committee, I so move.

Resolution C-2:

"WHEREAS the labour movement is only as strong as the unity and solidarity of the membership; and

"WHEREAS the ability of the labour movement to realize the policies of the Canadian Labour Congress and federations is directly related to the strength of labour councils; and

"WHEREAS the effectiveness of many labour councils is undermined due to lack of participation; and

"WHEREAS it is a basic principle that those who determine the policies of the labour movement must participate and be responsible for implementing these policies at the local level;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Article V, Section 7, of the Canadian Labour Congress Constitution be amended by adding: 'Any local unions, branches or lodges which are not affiliated in good standing with the federation of labour and labour councils in their vicinity where such exist shall not be entitled to recognition or representation at the Convention'."

Resolution no. C-2 asks for Article V, Section 7 of the Constitution to be changed to provide mandatory affiliation of all local unions or affiliates to federations and labour councils. We had considerable debate and considered the question in depth as was the case when the Commission on Constitution went across Canada to discuss with all of the affiliates the question of affiliation to labour councils and federations. We believe, as a Committee, that all locals should be affiliated with the federations and labour councils. We do not want to be misunderstood in any way, that our recommendation of non-concurrence leaves any impression that there is any feeling from among this Committee membership that there should not be affiliations; we believe that there should be. We believe that it is not correct for the Congress, at this stage in our history, after all of the time that has gone by since the Congress was formed, to now make a mandatory provision.

We believe that there has been substantial success over the years, particularly in the affiliation with federations. We believe that major progress has now to be made in respect to the affiliation of the local unions, of our affiliates, to labour councils. We are still not completely on the road to affiliation with the federations; but we believe that very definitely, all of the locals should be affiliated. It is wrong in principle to expect that union membership that pay per capita tax to the Canadian Labour Congress can somehow, by another section of the Constitution, be denied seating at a CLC Convention. We think that this is a governing body that works on the principles of trade unionism and voluntary relationships. We have had extensive discussion on the subject and we would urge them all to become affiliated. We believe it would be improper for the CLC Convention to change the Constitution to require it, as this point in time, and we will work with all of the affiliates to make sure that as much as possible is done. The Public Service Alliance of Canada, in respect to federations only, five or six years ago had only 50 per cent affiliation to federations; now 83 per cent of their membership is affiliated to federations. We are making good progress. We expect that we can do better and do more in the next two years, and we recommend and encourage your support to the Committee's recommendation of non-concurrence.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Do I have a point of order?

MR. S. BECKINGHAM (CUPE): Yes, the brother was talking out of both sides of his mouth, and you let him continue . . .

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, the Chairpersons of the Committees have more time than those at the microphones in order to present the report.

MR. S. BECKINGHAM (CUPE): I am not arguing that point, I am telling you he is saying one thing and the other.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I appreciate what you have to say, but would you please let us now start calling the speakers. The Committee recommends non-concurrence in resolutions C-2, 4 and 8.

MR. R. GINGERICH (CBRT & GW): I rise to speak in support of the Committee's recommendation and in doing so, I acknowledge the good faith and the good intentions of the proposers of this particular action. I acknowledge too and I accept the constitutional provision that is there, that provides a structure for the Canadian Labour Congress, that has to, of necessity, reflect an ideal world. However, I also recognize the reality of what is possible and what is apt to contribute to our long-term goal of complete, not just affiliation, but participation and interest and involvement in the important affairs of the labour movement within our labour councils and our federations of labour. The pros and cons in this Convention, on this issue, have no differences. We share the same objectives and the difference, as expressed by the Chairperson of the Committee, is really a difference of opinion as to whether you can legislate locals and union members to become active and to participate within the affairs of the labour movement at those two important levels. Further, it is a difference of opinion as to whether all of the unions that are affiliated with the Canadian Labour Congress could even carry out that provision, if this Convention saw fit to enact it. And I suggest to you that if, in fact, that kind of provision could not be carried out, this Convention would be doing a great deal of damage to the labour movement and to those long-term objectives that I have talked about.

I have spent virtually all of my adult life working in labour education and in dealing with the important principles and the progressive side of our movement. I have spent hours and hours and there are many delegates in this hall who have shared some of those situations with me, imploring and attempting to persuade locals to become active, and members to not just affiliate but to participate in all of the affairs of the labour movement.

However, I simply do not belive that it is right nor desirable, nor acceptable, to disenfranchise union members and locals from participation in the CLC Convention as a result of something that they might no have any control over. I can tell you frankly, within the union that I have the honour of representing, I have very serious doubts whether we would be able to get through our convention an amendment to our own Constitution that would require every local to be affiliated. If we could not do that, I do not have to say much more about how long our locals would permit this organization to contribute the hundreds of thousands of dollars in per capita fees that are paid to the Congress each year.

MR. M. LYONS (President, L.C. Metro Toronto): Labour council activists and supporters are certainly a persistent lot because here we are again for our fourth kick at the cat. I guess our persistence is just one of the reasons that we have had so many successes over the past number of years. I am not going to take time here to go through the many things that labour councils from across this country, from coast to coast, have done, not just for the labour movement, but for all working people in their communities, because we have heard, all throughout this Convention and previous conventions, about all those things that we are involved in and all the successes we have had.

I do want to point out that when those labour councils are undertaking those activities, when local unions come to us for assistance, when they come and ask us to go before a city council to help them fight contracting-out or privatization, or when the local unions come for education services or for social services that we are providing, I do not know of any labour council in this country that says to that local union: "Are you affiliated to our labour council or are you not? Because if you are not, we are not going to provide it." Our labour councils are providing those services to local unions whether or not they are affiliated because we believe in the labour movement. I will tell you, this is upsetting if we do provide those services to a local, get out and work out butts off to find out that the local is not affiliated when they come and ask us; and, more importantly, even after we have gone out and worked hard to provide those services and get that local what it wants, that they then still refuse to affiliate or are unable to affiliate to the labour councils. That is somewhat upsetting. Because if the labour movement is about anything, it is more about giving than getting.

It is somewhat upsetting here too, to sit and listen to debates on very important issues like free trade, privatization, deregulation, international affairs, and discussing policies that ask labour councils to undertake, on behalf of the labour movement, certain activities; to sit and watch people voting on those issues and know for certain that some of the people who are voting, requiring labour councils to take some activities, come from local unions that are not affiliated to the labour councils. Yet they ask us to take some action.

Our labour councils across this country have done some good things but we would have done a lot more if the current Constitution of the CLC was enforced. Article XV, Section 2, clearly says that affiliated organizations shall require their locals, branches and lodges to affiliate, "shall require". What has happened is that, over the years, that has not been enforced due to the arguments that we have heard over the past number of years as to why this cannot be done. But I only know one way to be involved in the labour movement, and that is to be all the way in. You cannot be part of the Congress but not be part of the federations and the labour councils. All the way in is what we ask. This labour movement does not believe in opting out. We do not provide for a voluntary dues structure for the members in our local unions, we do not go to them and say: "If you do not want to be a member of our local union, because you have some concern, then you do not have to pay any dues." We believe in compulsory dues deduction because we know that that is the way they get union security and having all locals affiliate to labour councils is the way to get even better union security.

I have heard, at previous conventions, the argument made against this particular amendment to the Constitution, but one argument I have never heard made is that the current requirement is wrong. All the arguments come down to a technicality and there has been some concern raised that if we introduce this particular constitutional amendment, then chaos may follow. But I have greater faith in the men and women of this labour movement. I have seen all the things that they can do and I have great faith in what they can accomplish.

If this constitutional amendment were passed, nothing would happen except that the affiliates would get back to their local unions and they would find a way to make sure that every single local union was affiliated to its local labour council, to its federation, and that particular clause that we are recommending be introduced would never, ever have to be enforced.

MR. D. JOHNSTON (President, N.W.T. Fed. of Labour): I realize that the brother from the Toronto Labour Council wants to increase his membership. He talks about the successes he has had. We have certainly had successes too in our federation, but without the Public Service Alliance of Canada being our largest affiliate, those successes would never have had come about and not one of those successes really affected a public service employee. All the successes that we have had have been in the territorial ordinances and such.

I stand in favour, of course, of the Committee's recommendation of non-concurrence. If this resolution was passed and the PSAC pulled out of our Federation of Labour, also the Yukon Federation of Labour, we would be effectively closed down within three months because that is our lifeline, the Public Service Alliance of Canada.

In 1945, I joined the union movement in Windsor, Ont., as an auto worker, and at that time my father told me that if you intend to get active and be involved in labour, that there is one thing you must remember: that you will be your brothers' and sisters' keeper. Well, that is what I am asking you people for, today. I wish you to vote with the Committee on the recommendation of non-concurrence with this resolution and be your brothers' and sisters' keeper in Northern Canada.

MR. D. BARRY (President, UE): I rise in opposition to the Committee's recommendation. I have been here at past conventions and quite frankly, I have heard the same arguments put forward as was put forward by the Chairperson of the Committee.

I listened to it last time around two years ago in Montreal, and I might have even been somewhat persuaded by the arguments that were put forward by the affiliates as to why they needed time, how we had to educate, how we had to get members to participate on a voluntary basis. I am not arguing against that. As I said, I was somewhat persuaded by that. But two years have gone by, and I have not seen any great groundswell of people that have been more actively, or affiliates that have been more actively, participating in the affairs of the labour councils and carrying out the program of this House of Labour.

The other day, when I spoke on free trade, I spoke on the question of unity and I still think unity is the key. I also spoke on the question of linkage. The CLC is linking the three corporate objectives together; free trade, privatization and deregulation. But there is also a linkage that takes place within the House of Labour. We need the people at the grass roots of this organization to carry out our programs. We did not hesitate in passing legislation here yesterday, unanimously calling on all of our brothers and sisters to stop working overtime. We asked for legislated ban on that, knowing full well that some of our brothers and sisters do not agree on the question. But we called for a legislated ban, maybe because we would feel we would have difficulty in putting that into place within our own organizations. We want another level of government to do it. But the point is we did that and we did it unanimously.

Quite frankly, I think if the type of will and perseverance were applied to the question of people voluntarily affiliating and being educated, then this resolution would not be necessary. But the fact is the resolution is necessary. We cannot carry out the programs that we have talked about and we have already decided upon, when we are sitting back there opting-out and not participating in labour councils. Now I understand there are some difficulties, when labour councils are not active in the community or are not even in the community. Those things have to be addressed with common sense. We have to convince people to be part of the labour movement, but we would have a better job of convincing them to carry out the programs if they are present within the House of Labour and if they are present within the labour councils carrying out those programs. So I would urge that the Committee's recommendation be defeated and that we get on with the job of bringing this House of Labour together once and for all.

MR. A. BURKE (Constitution and Laws Committee Member): I speak in favour of the Committee's recommendation of non-concurrence. I can assure you that the Public Service Alliance of Canada policy is that we will not force our locals to

affiliate. It is not that we are opposed to it, I can assure you. We went through the same experience with the federations of labour. I have been a member of the federation of labour as long as I have been a member of the union and I fully support the federations, and I fully support the district labour councils and so does the Public Service Alliance of Canada. But we do not support, and we will not support, forced affiliation of our locals. That has been a convention decision over and over again, and we will abide by it. We told the federations of labour, some time ago: "Come to us, present your case, we will make arrangements for you to approach our locals and to convince them that they should affiliate. They did that. We now have 85 per cent of our locals affiliated with the federations of labour in Canada and we are proud of that, and we will not be happy until we get 100 per cent of them. At the last Convention, our representatives suggested that the district labour councils come to us. We would go through the same procedure, we would put out literature, we would support them, we would arrange meetings, and only one district labour council has come to us and made the same approach.

I know the ideal thing is to have all of our locals totally affiliated in the House of Labour. but to me, to be affiliated means "you must participate". If you can sit here and tell me that you can force your local to become a full member of the House of Labour, and force them to participate, then you have got a different local and a different union that we have. It is not good to force them in. Money is not going to solve the House of Labour problems. What we need is participation of our members. By forcing affiliations, maybe we will get greater money in the pot, but any time the union has ever been any good, at any issue, and has ever achieved anything, it has been through the members' participation, and we cannot force them to do that.

So if you really want to put your act together, I again will say to you that the Public Service Alliance of Canada will do everything they can to assist you to get all the locals to affiliate, but it will be by their choice.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called. I am going to test the house, on this important issue. Point of order.

MR. G. MICHAUD (UAW): I have been to a few CLC Conventions in the past. I cannot recall at any time in recent years where there has been such an obvious sharp division between the delegates on the floor and the recommendation from the Committee and I wish that we could continue the debate.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): What is your point of order, brother? You want further debate? Then let us go to another mike.

MR. G. MICHAUD (UAW): The rules of this Convention are that we have a pro speaker and then we have a con speaker. Brother Burke of the Committee has spoken pro and I would suggest to you that it is another microphone's turn.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Well, as a matter of fact, brother, according to the list that is given to me as you walk up, it is a con mike that is now. You have won your point.

MR. J.C. PARROT (National President, CUPW): At the last two CLC Conventions, a majority of delegates have voted in favour of this resolution. Unfortunately, two-thirds were required, and this is why we were not successful in putting this in our Constitution. I am speaking against the Committee's recommendation and in favour of the CLC Constitution. The objective of the Constitution is to ensure that right across the country we have strong labour councils, capable of fostering the support needed to back the struggles of other men and women workers, to back CLC programs. During the last few years, all kinds of requests for support were made to the labour councils, for instance, to back up the Eaton boycott. I am from Ottawa; although no one was striking in that city, the Ottawa Labour Council was successful in organizing with affiliates a continuous boycott and picket line in front of Eaton's Ottawa stores. Without the labour council, we would not have been able to organize such a thing. A brother said earlier that participation cannot be forced, but how can you have participation if you have not yet joined the ranks? In our union, we have discovered that, even though our people did not participate after affiliating to the labour council, participation is much greater today.

Yesterday we unanimously adopted a ten-point program on the issue of free trade, deregulation and privatization. Let us look at what we have adopted. The Canadian Labour Congress, federations of labour, and local labour councils and affiliated unions will use every means at their disposal to make sure that all Canadians understand. That is what we have adopted. To use every means. the labour council must have everybody affiliated. We say at all levels, including the labour councils, we will undertake information and education campaigns; again they need the affiliates to do that. We are asking them to spend money to establish publications and education forums and special public meetings for the membership and the public at large. Are they going to be able to do that, if we do not give them the membership and the money? This is why I feel we should defeat this resolution even if I understand the position of certain people.

MR. M. DUDEN (UGWA): Our union, representing working poor people since the late 1800s, still represents working poor people. Our union cannot afford always to be affiliated. Sometimes we are affiliated, sometimes we are not. Most UGWA local unions are affiliated. I believe I only have one local union that is not affiliated with the federation of labour and the district labour council; and that is because they are constantly fighting their employer, spending money on arbitration cases, lost time for negotiations. The priorities of small local unions are the members; locking them out of this hall is not fair. If we are to continue to represent all working people in this country, we must allow them into our House of Labour. Our labour movement started off with participation, not money.

One other point I would like to make. In many jurisdictions across our country, there are no district labour councils. To make it mandatory for those that happen to live in areas where there are labour councils, is not really fair to the local unions that operate in districts where there are no labour councils. I believe this labour movement is about fairness, and it is not fair, and I support the Committee's recommendation of non-concurrence.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I am now going to test the House to put the question. All those in favour of the question being put, please show hands. Put your hands down please. Those opposed to my putting the question. It has been moved that I can put the question to the house.

I will recognize a point of order.

MR. G. MICHAUD (UAW, Canada): Maybe if you had heard my point of order, you would not have called for the question. What we normally do in this Convention is that we hear an equal number of speakers for and against the question. We have heard one more speaker for the question than we have against it.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, I have been very fair up here and the question was put to call the question. I have put it, the question has been called and agreed to. Now, I will put the motion.

We have been following this procedure every since I have been attending the Congress Conventions and certainly all this week, the same procedure has been practiced. I am now asking that we take the vote of non-concurrence on resolution C-2, C-4, C-8 and C-9. Now, you know it takes two-thirds vote.

I am going to now take the vote. I have called for it. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of non-concurrence, please show your hands. Hands down. Opposed. The motion of non-concurrence is carried.

I will now ask the Committee to step down.

What is your point of order, please, wherever it has been called from.

MR. L. RUFO (ITU): I would like to address you to the Constitution, Article V, Section 14.3, page 21: "When a delegate wishes to speak, he/she will proceed to one of the microphones." It has been bothering me through the Convention, when delegates sit down on their chairs and we can hardly recognize who is the one yelling and somehow the Chairperson of the Convention recognizes these individuals prior to those that are duly recognized and prepared to address this Constitution and this microphone. To me, that is an injustice to democracy, when people are not prepared to stand and wait for a microphone, then deny the right to speak to others and almost pressure you to call a question, when the Constitution itself clearly says that this individual will address to a microphone if he wishes to speak.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, I also remind you that when I have put the question as it had been called, it has always been either unanimous that the question be put, or more than the two-thirds more than the majority.

I would like to introduce the next guest.

We have the great privilege and opportunity today to hear from the International President of the Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks, who is representing the AFL-CIO, Richard Kilroy.

Brother Kilroy was born in Texas, Maryland, on July 31, 1927 and is a graduate of Calvert Hall High School in Maryland. He served in the United States Army from 1945 to 1948. He was elected the Vice-President of his union and its name has changed from the Transportation Communication Employees' Union in 1968 After the TCEU merger with BRAC in early 1969, he served as a division Vice-President in the merged union. In 1973, he was elected a BRAC International Vice-President, a position to which he was re-elected in 1975 and 1979.

By a unanimous vote of the Union's Executive Council on August 4, 1981, Brother Kilroy was elected BRAC International President to complete a term of office that ended August 31, 1983. At the July 1983 Convention of BRAC, he was elected to a full four-year term as President. He was elected a Vice-President of the AFL-CIO during the November 1981 Centennial Convention, and now serves on the Federation's Executive Council and on several key committees. He is a member of the Board of Directors of the African-American Labour Center and the Asian-American Free Labour Institute and also serves on the board of the Union Labour Life Insurance Company.

He was elected Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the Railway Labour Executives' Association by acclamation at its February 1982 meeting. Comprising the leaders of all standard railway labour organizations, the RLEA is a policy making group dealing with legislative and regulatory issues affecting railway workers.

ADDRESS BY RICHARD I. KILROY
Fraternal Delegate from the AFL-CIO

MR. R. KILROY (BRAC President, Fraternal Delegate AFL-CIO): Thank you very much. Sister Carr may remember my first Convention after being elected in 1983, and we were very proud to have her as one of our speakers at that Convention. For Dennis McDermott, my commendation goes to him and the best of luck to him. With the criticisms, of course rightly so, of the two conservative administrations of our respective countries, someone gave me an Irish prayer that might fit some of those people, and it goes like this: "May those who love us, love us. And those that do not love us, may God turn their hearts, and if He does not turn their hearts, may He turn their ankles so we will know them by their limping".

It is a great pleasure for me to bring you the warm greetings of the AFL-CIO and President Lane Kirkland on the occasion of this historic Convention, which marks the 30th anniversary of the Canadian Labour Congress.

As you look back on three decades of achievement and forward to the great progress that lies ahead, you can be certain that your brothers and sisters of the American labour movement will remain at your side, watching and learning and helping in any way they can. It cannot be otherwise. The economic and technological forces that are changing our world respect no national boundaries, least of all a boundary so long and so porous as that which separates our two countries.

Unless we choose, as we do not, to be the passive objects of these forces, to surrender to the superior wisdom of our employers and governments who profess to know what is best for our members, we are compelled to join hands in the defence of the interests of the working people.

Canadian workers, like it or not, can no more be immune to the consequences of the political and economic philosophy now dominating Washington than Canadian trees can be immune to the acid rain that crosses our borders. Unfortunately, the AFL-CIO has no Michael Deaver to whisper in the President's ear for a change in policy. We have to go to Congress and, ultimately, to the ballot box in November.

Meanwhile, we must work with our friends in the CLC and with other democratic trade union movements around the world to see to it that workers are not exploited and victimized by the misguided economic policies of their governments and financial elites.

In my own country, the free market philosophy has been enshrined as a dogmatic panacea to all problems, but nowhere has its mindless application proven more destructive than in the field of international trade. Although few governments in this world really believe in "free markets" or practice "free trade", the administration clings to these theories despite a devastating trade deficit that has climbed to a $150 billion a year. Last month alone, even with the Saudis slashing oil prices and increasing production, the financial hemorrhage amounted to more than $12 billion.

This translates into a loss of 11.5 million jobs between 1980 and 1984, according to a government study.

The AFL-CIO, like the CLC, understands change. Indeed, throughout our history we have been agents of change and, even now, we are searching for new and better ways of strengthening our movement and serving our members.

But there is change and there is change. We do not embrace changes that erode our nation's industrial base, export jobs overseas and wipe out perhaps forever skills built up over generations.

This is not the time to outline a program for dealing with the trade union problems that Canadian and American workers face in common. But of one thing I am certain, we have to work on them together and in concert with our brothers and sisters in the world free trade union movement.

One of the forums for doing that is the ICFTU, which the AFL-CIO re-entered after many years of absence. We do not always agree with the views expressed there by other national labour centres, but we do not expect to. The ICFTU is not a monolith. It is a diverse organization that reflects the pluralism within the international free trade union movement.

That does not mean it is a mere debating society. It does help to co-ordinate a common trade union strategy within the International Labour Organization and, thereby, to strengthen labour and human rights standards throughout the world. It has been a focal point of aid to the Solidarity trade union movement of Poland and to the emerging black trade union movement of South Africa.

In those countries, and in so many others, most recently the Philippines, the trade union movement has been in the forefront of the struggle for political and social change and I think we can all be proud of our ties to that struggle.

This 30th anniversary Convention also marks a change of guard in your leadership. On behalf of the President Lane Kirkland, I want to pay tribute to Dennis McDermott who has given such distinguished leadership to this movement. We have worked with him closely over the years and have come to respect and value his dedication to the Canadian workers and to the trade union cause. We wish him all the best, he deserves it.

We are confident that we will enjoy an equally warm relation ship with his successor, for the times demand it.

We will have our differences from time to time. That is healthy and appropriate; from debate and the interaction about varied perspectives, we can only benefit.

Whatever are our differences, they are overwhelmed by the common challenges and opportunities that we shall be confronting together in the spirit of solidarity. I wish you all a great and productive Convention.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you very much, brother.

Before I allow the Committee to start, I would also like to let you know that we have with us this morning Brother Bob Rae, the leader of the Ontario New Democratic Party.

Day of Mourning

MR. R. MERCIER (Executive Vice-President, CLC): We have been advised that the Federal Minister of Labour, Bill McKnight, in the House of Commons on April 28, called attention to the Day of Mourning; that the Mayor of the City of Edmonton, Alberta, proclaimed April 28 a Day of Mourning with one minute of silence observed by all municipal employees. The Cities of Vancouver and Burnaby decided to support April 28 as the official annual Day of Mourning for workers killed and injured on the job. The municipalities of Kitimat and Terrace in Northern B.C. passed resolutions to recognize April 28; and, at the request of the Kitimat-Terrace Labour Council, have agreed to lower their Canadian flag to half mast on that date.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I now call on the Committee dealing with the Report of the Occupational Health & Safety Committee. Our report is in document 10.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

MR. C. GODBOUT (Occupational Health and Safety Chairperson): I will ask the Secretary of the Committee, Sister Verna Ledger, to read the resolutions.

MS. VERNA LEDGER (Occupational Health and Safety Committee Secretary): The first resolution that we will deal with is a substitute resolution, replacing OHS-1, OHS-7, OHS-8, OHS-11, OHS-34, OHS-35, OHS-36, OHS-37, OHS-38, OHS-56, OHS-59, OHS-62, OHS-74, OHS-75, OHS-79, and OHS-80:

"WHEREAS asbestos is a known human carcinogen with no known safe limit of exposure; and

"WHEREAS the CLC has a policy of zero exposure to carcinogens; and

"WHEREAS several countries have a partial or total ban on asbestos, or are moving in that direction; and

"WHEREAS several Canadian unions are engaged in a practical campaign to have asbestos eliminated from workplaces and removed from the public buildings and other places such as marine vessels; and

"WHEREAS the International Labour Office is moving rapidly towards a Convention and resolution on the safety and the use of asbestos with the participation of the Canadian Labour Congress; and

"WHEREAS some asbestos substitutes are proven to be less unsafe on the balance of the probabilities while others are not so proven; and

"WHEREAS mining/production is the sole industry in some Canadian towns; and

"WHEREAS jobs will be lost without the creation of industries and jobs in those towns to replace asbestos-related work; and

"WHEREAS these same workers have struggled and achieved safer working conditions and reduced asbestos dust levels;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC, in collaboration with its affiliates and federations, continue to work for an effective ILO Convention and Recommendation on safety in the use of asbestos; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC work for adoption of the said Convention and Recommendation by Canadian governments as a national code for the mining, production, processing and use of asbestos, including its removal from places of work such as buildings and vessels; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that exposure to asbestos be at the zero level through control at the source; that, where this is not possible, all available engineering control devices be used to keep exposure to the lowest technically possible level; and that, where possible, asbestos should be replaced by substitutes that are proven to be less unsafe in comparable conditions of use on the balance of the probabilities; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC demands the same type of legislation, controls and research into asbestos substitutes that we demand for asbestos itself, and that appropriate controls be adopted and enforced; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that production of substitutes and alternative products should be funded and located so as to result in retraining and no net job loss in asbestos dependent communities; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC demands the formation of a special fund, financed by industry and government, administered by the workers, to deal specifically with information, training and education in safety in the use and handing of asbestos and asbestos-containing products."

The Committee recommends concurrence in the substitute resolution.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence in the substitute resolution dealing with asbestos.

MR. F. DAOUST (QFL): If, in the past, the Quebec trade union movement had been nonchalant about the asbestos issue, if it had not been vigilant, if it had not waged the necessary battles to clean up every work place where asbestos was used, we would not be morally entitled to come here to ask you to support this resolution on the safe utilization of asbestos. Had we been willing to barter health and safety for jobs, we would be unworthy of the task that is ours and of the mandates entrusted to us, including one approved unanimously by the General Council of the QFL a few weeks ago. I want to read to you one resolve of one of the resolutions dealing with the subject: "Be it further resolved that the CLC, in collaboration with its affiliates, recommend that this agreement be based on a practical approach whereby hazards associated with the use of dangerous products can be effectively controlled or, failing that, products proven to be less harmful can be substituted for them."

The history of trade unionism in Quebec is heavily marked by the painful struggles that we conducted on the asbestos issue. It is perhaps in the normal order of things that it be like that, for Quebec is the world's largest producer of asbestos, and the com-

panies that have exploited this natural resource have nearly always been powerful, fierce, and pitiless multinational corporations. It must be said that, through modern methods and technical processes, we have largely succeeded in keeping the mining, the processing and the use of asbestos reasonably well under control. But let there be no mistake about it; it is union action that has provided that type of protection for the men and women workers in Quebec. If the companies reacted, if the governments understood, it is because thousands and thousands of unionized Quebec workers engaged in difficult, rough and very long strikes in 1949 and 1975. It is because some unionized Quebec workers conducted public awareness campaigns. It is because unionized Quebec workers participated in mass demonstrations on the subject. It is because the trade union movement has conducted these battles that today, in Quebec, have legislative support and collective agreements in that sector, which permit us to assert that our battles were not in vain. The health and safety of the asbestos workers is under control, as Brother Louis Laberge stated in the document that was distributed.

At this stage, I do not want to pass in silence over the tremendous work of the United Steelworkers on this question, in Quebec as well as elsewhere in Canada. Although there is still much to do, we must point out where we have been successful. What we want for ourselves, we also want for all men and women, in every country, whatever type of worker. We want for them the safe use of asbestos. This is our objective, just like we want safety in the use of all hazardous products which may endanger the health and safety of workers, wherever they may be. Therefore, we must, at this point, give proof of unity, which will be essential when this subject is raised at the International Labour Organization meeting in a few months. We therefore wish that all the resolves be adopted. This concurs with the position of the QFL — 37 large QFL affiliates, 425,000 members, 15 labour councils. In perfect unanimity, they adopted resolutions that concur with the positions that are being submitted by the Committee. On behalf of the QFL, of the Quebec workers, of health and safety, we urge you to adopt this resolution.

MR. R. ROY (UE): I rise to speak against the recommendation of the Committee. This is a difficult question for me to deal with, as I am a member of the Quebec Federation of Labour. I agree with Brother Daoust that the trade union movement in Quebec waged great battles in an attempt to civilize the asbestos industry. After the death of thousands of persons and workers caused by asbestos, this product is still dangerous and carcinogenic. We have no control over that. We have not changed the physical characteristics of the asbestos fiber, which remains as dangerous as it was when we undertook the battle to make its mining and our plants safer. This is the reality.

I understand the position of the asbestos workers. There are people today who are faced with the alternative of either earning a living or of being out of work. They are not responsible for this, the responsibility lies with our governments that have always refused to adopt policies of full employment to ensure that there be work for everyone. Had we today full employment in Canada or in Quebec, we would not be here to discuss the asbestos issue; this subject would be banned forever. I am willing to accept the theory that technology and work methods have been developed in order to protect the workers who extract and finish off such products. But what worries me the most is that these products will be sold to underdeveloped countries that do not have the technology, nor the means to protect themselves against their effects. This is immoral.

The question of union credibility and international solidarity is at stake. Granted, we conducted battles here, but we must think also of the outcome, of those who will be using the products of our labour. Asbestos is still dangerous to human health, and we are going to sell this to developing countries that do not have the material, technological, and financial means to protect themselves.

This is why I am against the resolution as it is being presented. There is something missing in what is being proposed here. No one has suggested the possibility of having a phasing-out period to gradually eliminate asbestos and replace it with substitute products. We should use that period of time to apply our financial means, human and technological resources, and scientific knowledge to really develop a product that could replace asbestos. At the same time, we could see to it that men and women workers, whose jobs are affected by this change, are compensated and offered alternative work.

This is the direction we should take, and not the one being advocated today, if we wish to keep the credibility of the labour movement with regard to the protection, the health, and the well-being of workers and of the population.

MR. E. VANCE (Steelworkers): I stand in support of the resolution. We have similar concerns. If this resolution instead of using the word "asbestos" used the word "uranium" or "radiation", I would also be standing in support of such a resolution. The tragedy of Elliot Lake and the uranium miners of Ontario is one that is recorded. It should go down in the history of the labour movement as one of the greatest tragedies the workers have ever seen. The same thing could be said for asbestos. The similarities between asbestos and radiation of the miners who mine that resource is quite startling. For instance, in the 1930s, in the 1940s, industry knew that the workers working with asbestos were developing asbestosis and lung cancers. That information about those cancers and asbestosis cases were denied; the workers were denied the knowledge of that information until they found out too late. Even with the mining of uranium, the industry and the government knew, before we put the hole in the ground in Elliot Lake, the consequences and the hazards involved, yet we were never informed. To date, from the ELliot Lake uranium mine there have been 275 lung cancer deaths, 538 silicotics and pre-silicotics. That tragedy continues from our ignorance, our misinformation of the past.

Today, those conditions are different because we know. When we found out, through the process of collective bargaining and legislative reform, the United Steelworkers have now set the example for the labour movement, not just in North America but throughout the world on those achievements. The same goes for asbestos. Steelworkers took the approach that we would mine safely or not at all. If we could not get what we wanted at the bargaining table or in the legislative forum, we would close the mine down, illegally close the mine down. The consequences of our demonstration in 1974 resulted in the Occupational Health and Safety Act of the Province of Ontario and we are proud of that. During the process of collective bargaining for those agreements on health and safety, for the best possible conditions, we left the bargaining table on numerous occasions. But we got the best. The same thing in asbestos. Becaues one employer who was mining asbestos in the Province of Ontario, in the mid-1970s, would not come across, that mine closed and the Steelworkers closed it and were proud to close it, because they would not put in the necessary requirements to mine the product safely.

I speak in favour of this resolution as an alternative because we know there is no safe threshold. Knowing that, then they have to negotiate the best possible working conditions for those people who went to those mines. In the Province of Quebec there are those who would support the banning of asbestos. I ask those people, if we stop mining uranium, then you better put the lights out in this hall because you will have no lights. The same thing applies with those miners who are mining asbestos safely in the Province of Quebec. Their livelihoods depend on it, and your livelihoods depend on it just like the livelihoods of many depend on nuclear power in this province.

MR. A. KUBE (President, BCFL): I am standing here with extremely mixed emotions because you know it was about 38 years ago when I first helped to assist miners in Quebec who

worked in the asbestos industry in their struggle against their employers. At that particular time, they happened to belong to the CNTU but I think the whole trade union movement supported them in their struggle. And I so stand here with mixed emotions, because I have members from my own federation who engaged in the mining of asbestos. On the other hand, I have a friend who is a member of the Heat and Frost Insulation Union, who is dying of asbestos. So, therefore, I think it is very important that we ask ourselves one very basic question and that is: how do you eliminate asbestos by continuing to mine it; or do you stop the mining of asbestos? And I would suggest to you that we have to stop mining asbestos and address the plight of the people who are going to be replaced by that action, because asbestos is unsafe. Not only for Canadian workers, it is unsafe but for workers wherever they are. Therefore, in trying to say that we export so much asbestos, we basically are saying it might be okay to export death.

Too often the workers get hurt when we discover that there is something dangerous to our health. I would rather have a worker unemployed and struggling to adjust to society so we can have clean, safe jobs, so we can make a decent living, than see workers facing a situation where they have to die for work. And that is really the question before us. Unfortunately, the Committee did not address the question contained in resolution 35 which calls for the banning of mining of asbestos. I think what we should be discussing at this Convention is what sort of adjustment programs should be mounted for the communities that are mining asbestos now, to make sure that the living standard of these people is maintained. There should never be the question, "How much worth is attached to a worker's life?" Workers deserve a clean and healthy environment; on that we can never compromise. We cannot repeat the mistakes of the past as when we saw a number of Steelworkers die at the smelter north of Peterborough, because at that time we did not know that it hurt them. We cannot repeat the mistake, for instance, when we saw miners mining fluorspar and dying subsequently of it. This is an economic issue in terms of relocating workers and finding alternate, meaningful employment; and that is what they should have been discussing.

MR. A. BROCHU (Steelworkers): Of course, I am in favour of the resolution. I wish to congratulate the Committee for their excellent work in presenting a resolution that will finally let us decide through a vote. We knew that there was a problem with asbestos. When we learned about it, we took the means to fight it. So, today, we can work safely with asbestos. We engaged in difficult struggles and strikes that lasted up to seven months. We forced the governments into passing laws to protect people that were sick and to provide for the future. We are now looking towards the future.

At the present time, we have functional and efficient health and safety committees in the plants to monitor the workplace. We do inspections, conduct inquiries at the workplace. We have health programs and medical controls. We also have one for prevention and protection of the environment. We negotiated clauses on occupational health and safety in our collective agreement and also on the participation and the direct involvement of the union in taking industrial health measures. We asked that there be controls regarding asbestos. We fought to obtain this and, today, unions have control over the workplace. This is due to our involvement and participation in that sector. We can now work safely in the asbestos industry.

Solidarity, which is a theme of this Convention, has a role in the struggle for employment. When you speak of solidarity, you speak of employment. What are we going to do about asbestos? Where is the solidarity of this Convention for the union battles we have been waging for years? Today, it is our turn at the bat along with the asbestos issue. Tomorrow, which toxic product will take its place? Benzene, the nuclear? Everyone is aware of technological changes and what they can do. We lived through them with asbestos. We used them to improve our workplaces, to make them safer. Solidarity with regard to employment is the responsibility of this Convention, and so is being in favour of the resolution on the safe use of asbestos, for, tomorrow, another product may be at fault, and you may be the ones directly concerned by the issue.

MR. W. CHEDORE (CUPW): I stand here opposed to the Committee's recommendation. When I first looked at that so-called compromise resolution, I wondered exactly what they were getting at when they said it was a compromise resolution. The only thing that I see that this particular resolution does, is compromise the health and the safety of working people and the citizens of this country. On Monday, we talked about injured workers, we talked about the death of workers on the job, we stood for a moment of silence in honour of those who have died on the job due to work-related injuries or illnesses. I do not see that this resolution, as proposed, is consistent with the stand that we took on Monday. This is not a political debate. It is a matter of whether or not we force governments and business to provide safe work areas for workers in this country. That is what it is about.

I understand the positions that are being put forward by the workers that are involved in this industry and we are not saying we are going to go and force somebody to close down these mines tomorrow. We are not saying that at all. But if I was going to look at a compromise resolution on anything that has been put forward here, it would not be this one. Let us talk about what we can do to provide jobs for those workers in other areas, where they do not have to look at a short life span because they are working in those mines. That is what we can force the governments and the companies in this country to do, that is where we should be putting our energies. I heard and read reports where we have government officials going into Third World countries to try to sell asbestos, where there are absolutely no laws and protection anywhere comparable to what we have, and I do not think the ones we have go far enough. We stood here on Monday and we talked about support for workers in Third World countries and Latin America and South Africa.

And the continuation of mining of asbestos means that if we do not use it in this country and do not use it in the United States, they are going to find a market. And where the hell do you think they are going to sell it? They are going to sell it in the Third World countries where the legislation is not there to protect the citizens of those countries against this type of material or anything else.

I urge everybody here to look at and understand what we are talking about. I urge the workers in the QFL and the Steelworkers to look and consider their families; do not make the choice between your lives and your livelihood, because there should never be a choice in that area. You have to look at what can be done; and the alternative is not to keep mining this. I do not think there is a safe use for asbestos. I do not think there ever will be. Thousands of workers across North America die of this yearly. We are here to support workers, in areas of health and safety and economics. Your money is no good to you and your family when you are six feet under the ground.

MR. L. LABERGE (President, QFL): We have to be at least honest with ourselves in this debate. The delegate that just preceded me said: "We are not asking to close down the mines". That is exactly what he was asking: to close down the mines. In Geneva, in June, if a resolution against asbestos is adopted there, it will mean markets closing, it will mean fewer jobs, the mines will close down. Now I am not going to say to you that asbestos is not dangerous. Of course, it is dangerous, so are many other things, particularly the products with which they want to replace asbestos. Every product that contains fibers is dangerous, is carcinogenic. Let us not kid ourselves. Last year in the construction industry, more than 150 workers were killed, only in Quebec. Health and safety is something that we have always concerned ourselves with.

I am the head of the Health and Safety Committee of the Quebec Fed. We have led, I do not know how many demonstrations and so forth, in order to get what we feel is perhaps the best legislation across Canada and perhaps even on the North American continent, preserving the health, the safety of the people, prevention and compensation. I would not be standing here asking you to adopt a resolution that would put in danger not only workers of Quebec, but workers the world over.

Some of the speakers who just spoke certainly are aware that their comrades in Russia have become the greatest producers of asbestos, and they do not give a hoot about any resolution being adopted. We do, because we respect the labour movement, because we respect democratic organizations. That is the name of the game.

Asbestos is dangerous. But we have developed ways — not only to extract it from the ground — that are safe, absolutely safe. We cannot obtain zero exposure. Can we obtain zero in uranium? Can we obtain zero in driving a car? We do not live in a dream world, we live in a very realistic world. What we have to do is fight to protect the people that we represent; and we are doing that. I would not be asking the delegates to support this resolution, if we had not also developed safe ways and means not only to extract asbestos, but to handle it, to make products with it. We have developed those safe ways and we will continue to do that.

This is what this resolution is all about. If the ILO adopts a resolution, starting from the Canadian Labour Congress, we can go to the ILO and get a resolution and that would provide even more safety, if at all possible, for all of the people of the world who have to handle asbestos. We have to allow that to keep the people working, because our Russian comrades are producing asbestos.

And let us not kid ourselves, if the resolution is turned down, I think that we are dead at the ILO Conference in June. If the resolution were to be adopted, we will have a fair chance to keep our people at work; we would have a fair chance to get asbestos all over the world handled in a safe way.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being asked for and I will test the house. All those in favour of the question being put. Hands down. Point of order.

MR. J. MARTIN (Steelworkers): You have allowed a pro speaker on the issue, you should have allowed a con. I would appreciate it. You knew that I am a Steelworker from the largest Steelworker local in this country, duly elected to come to this Convention. The executive people see me sitting here since 9:00 o'clock this morning, and I know it is up to yourself, as the Chairperson, to pick the mikes you are going to allow to speak, but I respectfully request that you allow Local 1005 to tell the true story of the users of asbestos in this country that arises.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, I personally have not been picking the mikes. I have people here trying to do that job for me. The question has been called. I am going to test the house. All those in favour of the question being put. Hands down. Those who do not want the question to be put, hands up. The motion for ending debate has failed, and I will go now to the next mike.

MR. J. TURK (UE): I am a member of the Ontario Federation of Labour, Health and Safety Committee. It is always difficult to speak after Brother Laberge. What is being posed to us today is a choice between jobs and health. It is irresponsible in my view, for the Committee to have forced this Congress to have to make that choice. There are jobs of thousands of asbestos workers in the Province of Quebec, and also in B.C. and Newfoundland. On the other hand, there is the death of hundreds of workers in Canada, thousands of workers in the United States and tens of thousands of workers in the Third World that are at stake if this policy passes. We should not have to make the choice between jobs and our health; we want both. We should have this motion referred to call for a phased-in ban on the use of asbestos, and to put pressure on the federal and provincial governments to use their powers to provide alternative work for the Quebec, B.C. and Newfoundland miners and other workers in the asbestos industry.

Much of this debate has focused around the mining of asbestos; but the danger of asbestos exposure is all the way through the life cycle of the product. In the processing of fibers, in the installation of the products, in the use of the products, in the maintenance work done by thousands of maintenance workers, in the dismantling of asbestos products, their removal and disposal, there is danger from the use of this asbestos. So it is not a matter just of jobs in the mining industry because we conceivably could make that safe by putting all miners in space suits, but that does not deal with the carpenters and all the other workers who have to work with the product. There is no safe use of asbestos, an that has to be addressed in this debate.

The resolution implies there is. It is disgusting to see this Convention dealing with a resolution which takes the same line as employer organizations, company doctors and health professionals tied to employers, who claim that it can be used safely when we know that it cannot.

We have talked a lot about Ronald Reagan's America, today and in the past two days. In Ronald Reagan's America, there is a proposal that is being brought forward to ban asbestos, this ban to be phased in over ten years. The reason this is on the floor today is an attempt to join with the Canadian government and getting Canadian labour to fight the Environmental Protection Agency's decision in the United States, to fight the Reagan government and the Minister of Mines in lobbying against this essential action for workers. I do not know if you have known anyone who has contracted lung cancer or mesothelioma, which is a kind of cancer that grows in the body cavities, primarily around the lungs and around the abdominal cavity. They are particularly awful kinds of cancer. With mesothelioma, people die within two years of contracting the disease and die in constant pain. The Environmental Protection Agency has very carefully shown that if the standards that exist in Canada applied in the United States, there will be over 3,000 deaths due to cancer. In the Third World, where there are no standards, there will be tens of thousands of deaths if this policy is implemented. In the United States, they are looking at a policy of one-tenth the Canadian standard and at that level, they estimate that there will be over 1,500 deaths, just due to those two kinds of cancer.

We must move to refer or defeat this resolution. I prefer referral, so we can go on record as favouring alternative work for the people in the asbestos industry, while providing for the health and safety of all Canadian, American and Third World workers. Surely we, as a labour movement, can take that position.

MR. G. GAUGHER (CUPE): I stand in support of the resolution, because I think it is the workers' way of dealing with these matters. I think that in Quebec we have seriously improved, during the past few years, on all matters concerning health and safety in workpalces. One example was given yesterday: the effective right for a pregnant worker to a real protection. There is still a lot to do in these matters, but we realize today that health and safety is present on a day-to-day basis in each of our local unions.

Asbestos workers have played a big role in recognition of the necessity to improve health and safety and especially in the recognition of industrial disease by the Health and Safety Board of Quebec. But we must be conscious that, not too long ago, these workers had to deal with companies like Canadian Johns-Manville or General Dynamic, the American giant. These companies, as everyone knows, consider the workers as disposable things that must mean profit for them. So, there was no question at the time of financing research to reduce the risks exposed to

asbestos fibers. The nationalization of the asbestos industry has begun to change the situation. Technological progress has been made in dealing safely with asbestos. But was it too late? The giant lobby of American companies had already begun and the EPA is leading that lobby today. Governments are acting today against the dangers of asbestos, neglecting totally this technological progress. The same governments keep a total silence on the dangers of radiation, nuclear power plants, the working conditions in the chemical or textile industries. The asbestos debate, whatever final issue it will have, will have had a positive effect on the consciousness of the necessity to have an international convention for security and control in the use of all contaminants and cancerous products in the workplace, and not only for asbestos.

The EPA started a war against asbestos, but what does that agency say about the exposure of Mexican workers to pesticides in California? About the massive spills of chemicals by American industry in their Great Lakes? About the American and Canadian planes flying at low altitude above native territories in Labrador? And finally, what does that agency say about the Agent Orange effects still affecting the Vietnamese population and thousands of American veterans? Where should we place our confidence as workers' unions? In the EPA, that rejects all scientific studies that do not fit its views on the dangers of asbestos, or in the workers who are fighting to improve their health and safety in the asbestos industry, and, by way of consequence, to improve the safety for consumers of products containing asbestos.

We cannot play poker with such a matter as the EPA does today. I stand strongly in support of the resolution.

MR. J. MARTIN (USWA): I would like to refer this resolution back to the Committee with instructions that they amend it to include provisions for a ten-year phase-in health period after which the use of asbestos will be banned in Canada. The governments must provide funds to establish manufacturing industries to produce safe substitutes and that these industries be located in the areas affected by the ban with guaranteed employment for those workers displaced. I respectfully request with instructions that it be brought back to this delegation floor tomorrow, Sister Carr.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, you know that if you refer, you cannot speak on it.

MR. J. MARTIN (Steelworkers): I referred. I did not speak, Sister Carr, and I will challenge your decision on that matter and put it to the vote of this delegation.

I specifically said I would like to refer it.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): All right, I will take the vote. Is there a seconder for your referral? It has been seconded. There is a motion to refer in front of the house, and I would ask you to raise your hands if you agree to the motion to refer. Hands down. Those opposed to the referral. It has been decided that it would be referred.

The Convention adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1986
Afternoon Session

Secretary-Treasurer Shirley Carr called the Convention to order at 2:05 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We are going to begin with the document no. 21, the Report of the Committee on Officers' Reports.

COMMITTEE ON OFFICERS' REPORTS

MR. J. MUNRO (Officers' Reports Committee Chairperson): The Secretary of the Committee will read the report.

MR. B. CLARK (Officers' Reports Committee Secretary): "The members of the Committee on Officers' Reports would like to draw to the attention of the delegates the Solidarity Address, the Report of the Executive Council, and the Report of the Secretary-Treasurer with the accompanying Financial Statement.

"The Committee commends all those who are responsible for preparing these documents and would strongly urge the delegates to read these statements carefully. These three documents form a clear, concise and accurate report on the last two years' activities of our central body.

"The Committee cannot hope to comment on all aspects of these reports but we do wish to bring to the attention of the delegates some of the major accomplishments of the Congress since the last Convention and the immediate future challenges confronting us.

"We are in complete agreement with the theme 'Peace and Unity' chosen for this Convention. These issues, as the Solidarity Address so well documented, are crucial to the survival of the human race, of our country, and of our trade union movement. In celebrating the 30th anniversary of our Congress, the issues confronting us today are the same as those confronting the delegates to the founding Convention. The Committee shares the Solidarity Address' concern that we must all maintain our vigilance and seek our solutions through unity and collective action. As this Address stated:

> 'As we chart our course for the months and years to come it is imperative that we do so united in solidarity. Brothers and sisters, side by side; public sector workers, private sector workers, side by side; older worker, younger worker, side by side.'

"The Committee also shares the concern running throughout all of these documents with the vicious attacks on the trade union movement and all working people, by the combined forces of hostile governments and the business community. The Committee commends the fight-back campaigns launched by the Congress against deregulation, privatization, and free trade. This three-pronged attack, under the guise of greater individual freedom, strikes at the very heart of the trade union movement, the standards of living of workers and their families, the poor, the elderly, the young, and the defenceless. The federal government's obsession with the deficit is quickly shifting the whole burden of taxation to working people and away from corporations. The hard-won benefits of the trade unions, for which we have fought for many, many years and which many of us took for granted are now up for grabs unless we are united to protect them. The past few years have seen us counting as victories the maintenance of the *status quo*. For us to merely hang on to what we have, is, in many cases, a major victory. For many of our former members and their families, unemployment and welfare have become a way of life.

"In this respect, the Committee recognizes and commends the leadership shown by the Congress in mobilizing our collective forces and forging links with all like-minded institutions and groups at the national, regional, and local levels. It is this type of unity and leadership that will stand us in good stead in the years ahead. The Committee encourages the Congress to continue these efforts and to strengthen these links for the future battles that must certainly come.

"On the legal front the Committee commends the Congress for initiating and co-ordinating the defence of basic trade union rights from the right-wing attacks of such organizations as the National Citizens' Coalition. These right-wing groups, under the banner of individual freedoms are exploiting the Charter of Rights' provisions to destroy collective rights. Freedom of association and the right to free collective bargaining are at stake. The right for this Convention to endorse the New Democratic Party and to pledge financial support to it is at risk. The rights of local unions, affiliated unions, federations of labour are all in jeopardy in terms of participating in this country's political process. The Committee does not need to remind this Convention that, if this were to

happen, all the legislative protection, social security programs, medicare, affirmative action and unemployment insurance would pass into history. The Committee therefore would encourage the Congress to continue its efforts in this crucial area and to persuade all of our affiliated unions to co-operate and participate when it comes to co-ordinating these legal cases. Again, unity is the theme.

"Congress' activity has intensified in the organizing field. We would draw to the attention of the delegates the recent VISA strike and the long and difficult negotiations that accompanied it. The Committee wants to commend the Congress on the way in which this strike was successfully concluded. The denunciation of the CIBC's anti-union behaviour by the Canada Labour Relations Board is concrete proof of the bank's attempts to avoid unionization. We caution the Congress that it must not rest on its laurels but that it must continue its efforts to crack this bastion and open up the rights to organize and to bargain collectively to the thousands of workers in this industry.

"The Congress also conducted an extensive campaign to organize the workers at three of the Michelin plants in Nova Scotia. Because of the Michelin Bill, however, this organizing drive was unsuccessful in gaining an overall majority at all three locations. The Congress has now launched a court action against this anti-union piece of legislation in an effort to have it declared unconstitutional. Again, the Committee commends the Congress in these efforts.

"Through its Departments and Standing Committee, a great deal of activity has been undertaken. The Committee would like to draw to the attention of the delegates the Departmental Reports attached to the Executive Council's Report which give a detailed account of all those areas in which action was taken. The Committee commends all those staff people who worked long and diligently to put into practice the resolutions and directives which the last Convention determined.

"The Women's Bureau devoted considerable time and effort in pushing for legislation on affirmative action at the federal level. The resulting Bill C-62, 'An Act Respecting Employment Equity,' was disappointing to the Bureau but it will continue in its fight for effective legislation. The Committee commends the Bureau for its efforts as well as in convening the 5th Biennal Conference, 'Making Affirmative Action Work'.

"The Committee commends the work of the Occupational Health and Safety Department for its continuing efforts in this field and for the crucial part it played in getting the amendments passed into law in Part IV of the Canada Labour Code.

"The International Affairs Department is commended for the crucial role it continues to play in promoting peace and the cause of trade unions in the developing world. It was instrumental in funding grants and aid for humanitarian relief to the starving in Ethiopia; the channeling of funds to the families of striking miners in Great Britain; to education efforts in the Third World trade union movements; and in opposing racism and apartheid in South Africa.

"The Congress has also been active on the education front, planning educational seminars, producing and developing audio-visual and educational programs. The Committee would like to commend the Educational Services Department for its overall activities, especially in the area of instructors' training, which will pay great dividends in the future for the trade union movement in Canada.

"On the research and legislation front, that Department should be commended for its numerous activities in preparing briefs on a wide range of social, economic and legislative topics. This Department was heavily involved in organizing conferences, working with Standing Committees and participating in educational workshops as resource people.

"On the political action front, the Political Education Department has been very active, having been involved in a federal election and six provincial or territorial campaigns as well as by-elections in a number of ridings. The telephone canvass and the on-the-job canvass continue to be the focal point of the Department's efforts and the worth of this approach is proving to be positive. The Committee commends this Department's work on behalf of the New Democratic Party.

"Our Social and Community Programs Department has been heavily involved with outside organizations on housing, environmental issues, Fitness Canada, postal alert, human rights, anti-poverty, co-ops and youth. The Committee would like to see the Congress expand its activities in the social action field to complement its overall strategy of building bridges with its allies.

"The Committee wishes to highlight to the delegates the section of the Secretary-Treasurer's Report which discusses affiliation to the Congress and the growth of independent unions. The Committee agrees with the observation that if the past trend continues where only 56 per cent of all organized workers are represented in the Congress today where previously that number was 75 per cent, 'the future viability of the Congress to speak as the "voice of labour". . .' is seriously threatened. It is the Committee's view that the Congress must intensify its efforts and should consider the possibility of expending more in terms of time, effort and money to reverse this downward trend.

"Further to the Report of the Secretary-Treasurer, the Committee wishes to congratulate the Congress Officers for the careful handling of the Congress' funds. In spite of heavy expenditures in mobilizing the trade union movement through conferences, fight-back campaigns, legal costs in defending trade unions' rights in charter cases and strike benefit payments required to win the VISA strike, the Congress had a surplus of $669,882.

"We note with some satisfaction as well that this financial surplus was partially the result of an additional 84,832 members in 1985 over the previous 24 months.

"This concludes the report of the Committee on Officers' Reports.

"All of which is respectfully submitted by the members of this Committee:

Jack Munro, I.W.A., Chairperson
Bud Clark, A.C.T.W.U., Secretary
Alphonse De Cesare, B.C.T.W.
Susie Vallance, N.U.P.G.E.
Doug Anderson, C.W.C.
Maury Sjoquist, C.M.S.G."

MR. J. MUNRO (Officers' Reports Committee Chairperson): The Committee moves adoption of this report, on behalf of the Committee. I second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The adoption of document no. 21, Report of the Committee on Officers' Reports has been moved and seconded.

MR. L. RUFO (ITU): We are talking about the Solidarity Address, the report of the Executive Council as well as the report of the Secretary-Treasurer. While I am not totally objecting to the various reports referred in document no. 21, I do object to one section in the report of the Executive Council where they talk about the International Typographical Union in the report of the Organization Department. I believe whoever has written this section on the International Typographical Union is misleading this delegation; he is also misleading the Executive Council of the Canadian Labour Congress.

The report talks about some attempts at take-overs. The ITU at no time was the subject of being taken over by anyone. The ITU was offered a merger document by different unions and the membership decided, through a democratic process, through

referendum, provided in the Constitution, to all members including retirees. No other union present at this Convention can have their retirees vote on the Constitution, the ITU do. They were able to decide whether or not they wished to merge with these unions. The CLC interfered. They had some individuals interfering with the autonomy which is clearly spelled out in the Constitution of the Canadian Labour Congress, interfering with the autonomy of the ITU in regard to making a decision within its Constitution. We were not involved in taking-over, we were proposed a merger document. We are smart enough and we have enough knowledge, plenty, to make a decision. As you all know, printers know how to read and write, and we have for a long time. In fact, it is the oldest union in North America, it was founded in 1852.

Also it says in that section, that the President of the ITU has appointed a ranking officer, Dick Weatherdon. The President of the ITU has no right to appoint ranking officers. Again, through a referendum, we have two ranking officers elected. So this report is not true.

The happy ending occurred only because of the splendid CLC staff and the chartered bodies warning them and protecting the interests of our affiliated members. The other union asked if they would be able to merge with us, they have slapped our face again. We tried to get a document which had been thrown out and was no longer acceptable to the union we were supposed to be merging with; then it was the big promise and then the document which we were offered previously.

MR. D. GREY (ITU): I would like to make a couple of points, one on union-busting and one on organizing. I guess I am speaking following the previous speaker with whom I disagree.

I wish to thank the CLC President Dennis McDermott, Secretary-Treasurer Shirley Carr, the Executive Council and especially Wes Norheim and others for their support during the internal struggle of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, in their take-over attempt of our union in 1985. With the exceptional efforts of Wes Norheim and his fellow organizers, Canadian ITU members were encouraged to stay within the House of Labour. As a result of this support, the merger, affiliation, take-over whatever you want to call it, was rejected by a more than two-to-one majority vote of all Canadian ITU members and members across the continent. I wish to thank the Executive Council for their support.

On the union-busting front, we have a lock-out in Toronto, which the Canadian Labour Congress has just put on their national boycott list: it is at Burlington Northern Air Freight. We have been out on the street almost a year. This is a giant multinational U.S.-based company that has taken on 30 workers. We need the support of organized labour to win this dispute. Burlington Northern has been charged at the Ontario Labour Relations Board for bargaining in bad faith, unfair labour practices and an illegal lock-out. We have had 13 hearing dates to this point, with 13 more to go after a year, and you know what it is like when you have been out on the street for over a year. We continue the struggle and we need your help. Some of the customers ship auto parts, computers, periodicals and books and any bulk air-freight. If you can, go back and talk to your fair employers, go back to your local unions and help us support in this struggle. Again we thank the Executive Council of the CLC for their support.

MR. R. GINGERICH (CBRT & GW): I find myself in a position of standing at a con mike, something I thought I would not do, to deal with some aspects of the Officers' Reports about which I am most unhappy. Before I do that, I would like to clarify a question just in case there may be some procedural problem. I will tell you first of all, that I am going to speak of events that have occurred since January the first. I realize that the printed reports must by necessity be prepared in advance and that they can deal only with the events until December 31st. I simply want to clear that procedural matter first of all, to ensure that the elected officers and the Executive Council who are at this Convention are accountable to this Convention for the full term up to the date this Convention started. Would you clarify that please?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Yes, they are.

MR. R. GINGERICH (CBRT & GW): The issue that causes me so much concern is covered by other resolutions that have been submitted to this Convention. I understand that they will be dealt with later and I, accordingly, will not address the issue itself.

I simply have to say to you that we have witnessed over the past several months the most unbelievable, preposterous betrayal of trade union principles and our interests that I have ever seen in my life.

Every delegate in this hall, every worker in this country knows instinctively that what has been done is wrong, and unacceptable. I simply say with the greatest regret, to the officers and those members of the Executive Council who found themselves in that position, that I have to tell you that you have failed to give the leadership that you were given the obligation to do at the last Convention. I fully understand and I appreciate the mess with which you were presented back in January or February of this year, with an appointment by Prime Minister Mulroney. I sympathize with you. However, my argument with you — not to anyone personally, I say this generally — is that you had a choice at that time. You should have denounced what was done and made it very clear that that was not acceptable. Instead, you chose to take another course.

There has been absolutely no leadership given to the delegates to indicate that that kind of conduct is not acceptable, is not in line with trade union principles. And so I say that this Convention has been denied something by the officers who have failed them during their term of office. It pains me sincerely to have to say that but the fact is that you are elected not just to act, but to defend the principles that we have worked so hard to establish an to build upon. Those principles are all we have. It is all that separates us from General Motors and if that flame, that steady flame of principle is allowed to go out, then we will be nothing but business unions handling grievances. And I say to the leadership, with no one person being castigated, that is wrong and I regret so much that you have failed to give the kind of leadership that should have been done. I simply say that, in my opinion, you did not compound the problem by doing certain other things that I think are not warranted .The last thing I say is that I think that trade unions should not have to be associated with the actions that I referred to and I think that everybody knows what it is. I resent being embarrassed and insulted by having to share the hall with that kind of action and I urge everybody to join me at 2:45 and leave this hall.

MR. G. LEMIRE (BRAC): I am in favour of the report, but I would appreciate having a chance to pass some comments. I am worried about resolutions and debates on various subjects. We have a duty to fulfil, which is to represent the members. We can set the priorities that we wish, it is only among the rank and file that we can establish our credibility.

All the unions across the land hold conventions regularly at which they lay down policies. We are democratic to such a point that our entire working apparatus has become an enormous bureaucracy. We set up committees to study our demands and subcommittees to render everything even more complex. We are all members of our unions and officers at various levels representing the power of labour. One of the members of my union surprised me by the soundness of his judgment concerning the general view imposed upon us by governments and multinational corporations throughout the world and directed towards the pure and simple destruction of a generation of our children.

In the past, we had, every twenty or thirty years, wars that lasted a decade and would eliminate generations who sacrificed themselves or were sacrificed for glory's or religion's sake, or

simply on account of a dictatorship's policy. Take a good look at society everywhere in the world. For economic and social reasons, fathers and mothers are both working through necessity. As a result, a generation of youth is sacrificed, without work and without any hope of a better future. Losing all reason for a decent living is worse than dying for glory. As a union, we must use every possible means to secure the jobs they need to appreciate and respect the friends who represent them.

MR. G. LEVINE (CUPE): The Officers' Report is not normally a controversial document, but I have to take exception with the statement on page 2 of the report, dealing with the Department of International Affairs. The report says that the International Affairs department was instrumental in channelling of funds to the families of striking miners in Great Britain. From that quote one might believe that the International Affairs Department was instrumental in raising funds for the British miners during their bitter strike in 1984. I regret to inform the delegates that the opposite was true.

The CLC was not instrumental in raising funds. All that the CLC did was act as a post office in channelling funds raised by affiliates and others. When the British miners were battling Margaret Thatcher's government in 1984, on strike for a year, regretably they got very little help from the International Affairs Department. Indeed the CLC leadership wrote affiliates, discouraging assistance to a tour of a British miner who was going across Canada meeting with locals, trying to raise funds for the striking families. A number of people had to organize that tour, not with the assistance of the CLC, but in spite of the roadblocks that the CLC put up. In spite of that opposition, I am pleased to report that over $300,000 was raised. That is a lot of money, it is more than what was raised for any cause in the Canadian labour history for a battle outside of our borders. I think that this Convention should give credit to a few people who were instrumental in raising that money, particularly the leaders in the B.C. Fed., the Alberta Fed., the Ontario Federation of Labour, the Nova Scotia Federation of Labour and the Quebec Teachers' Union. They were instrumental in raising those funds and in particular I want to single out Dave Patterson of the Steelworkers and Dave Werlin of the Alberta Federation of Labour, who did yeoman's work in raising those funds.

Sister Carr, I hope that under your new leadership, in the future when workers anywhere in the world need our help, that that help will be given on the basis of need and help will not be withheld just because of politics of the leaders that the workers in that particular union have chosen. We do not need the CLC simply to act as a post office.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I am going to take a liberty here from the Chair and I just want to remind you that the Canadian Labour Congress is you, and to remind you also that four officers and the Executive Council did in fact go across this country for money for the mine workers. It was channelled through our International Affairs Department to the British trade union movement where in fact it met the needs of the workers. So please do not think we did not do anything. The same as yesterday when it was challenged that we had not done anything about COSATU, that is just not true.

MR. J. DUFF (UAW, Canada): I would be delinquent in my duty at this time if I did not respond to remarks made by one of the previous speakers, and you know very well what the remarks were. Allow me to tell you that I thought the issue was resolved on Monday morning. I thought the issue was explained in full detail and not a word was said; as a matter of fact, I saw some standing ovations. I was under the impression that I was a good trade unionist on the issues of unity and peace and solidarity. I understood that issue had now been resolved to the satisfaction of all of the delegates to this Convention; however, it is not so. It seems that somebody likes a sore, festering and cankerous. But I know you are not going to let that happen, brothers and sisters.

I had an experience like that about 24 years ago when I was a small boy. I was going for a job in New York City in a hotel. The hotel manager said: "Follow me, walk this way" and 30 applicants followed behind him. You know, we all listened. For goodness sake, this is an intelligent body! We are going to leave this hall at 2:45? We are not leaving any hall at 2:45. At 2:45 we will be listening to the farewell address of the President of the Canadian Labour Congress. That is what we are going to do at 2:45. In full detail it was explained to you today, that it is about time we had some trade unionists in the diplomatic field.

We did not learn diplomacy at some highly trained state college, we did not learn it over a dining room table, we learned the diplomacy in the school of hard knocks, and that is the finest lesson that we can get in our lives. I say to you right now that I think it is great that a trade unionist has a diplomatic appointment, because he will tell and speak in the language of the working people. It is a great thing to have a social democrat as an ambassador rather than a life-long Conservative or some guy who is a big banker or some guy who is an accountant of the public trust. These are not the people that should be representing us in a diplomatic station. I say I am happy to see a trade unionist, a trade unionist that I have known and worked with for 32 years, I say that is great.

MR. G. ASH (CUPW): Are we allowing a debate on the 2:45 presentation? Because if we are, I would certainly love to stand up here and talk about it. I think it is disgraceful what is going on here.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, we are dealing with the Officers' Reports.

MR. J. PORTER (UAW, Canada): I rise on a personal point of privilege. We, in this trade union movement, can have a lot of things that can divide us, but if someone wants to take a doctrinaire position and try to abandon this Convention, I think they are doing us all a disservice. If you want to talk about trade union principles, I will remind all the delegates here that Brother Gingerich was part of an executive that locked out their staff and then fired five of their national officers. So let us not get too pure. Dennis McDermott has represented this labour movement with dignity in the past. He deserves the support of this Convention and this Convention will respect Brother McDermott's position. That is the problem when you get too pure.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, we are dealing with the Report of the Committee on the Officers Reports; would you kindly refrain from any further unrelated discussion. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on the report itself?

MR. M. HURLEY (CUPE): I would like to address my remarks to the officer responsible for supervising the work of the International Affairs Department and specifically, I would like to deal with the problem which a number of affiliates have had with regard to working closely with the South African Congress of Trade Unions Solidarity Committee. I think it is widely known amongst those locals and affiliates which have worked closely with SACTU, that that co-operation has been discouraged.

In fact, I have a letter here from a representative of the CLC to a British Columbia Labour Council where he says: "Please be advised the CLC does not endorse this organization. There is some question about whether moneys donated to SACTU get to the people and are used for their intended purposes."

As a member of the CUPE local, whose members are closely involved in a sanctions campaign, in attempting to have our employer and our hospital employees throughout Ontario refuse to handle South African products, I really object very strongly to the interference in this work which the International Affairs Department obviously is conducting. I think it is about time we stopped this sectarianism and the red-baiting about this group, and just go on to delivering some concrete support to the workers in South Africa. The SACTU Solidarity Committee very clearly works

with trade unions and I think we should just cut out the nonsense and start supporting them.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I am now going call the question. The Committee's recommendation is concurrence with document no. 21. All those in favour of concurrence, please show. Any opposed. The document is adopted.

The Committee can step down with our thanks.

The Health and Safety Committee will be brought back on to the floor immediately upon the conclusion of the festivities for the President.

I would like now to take the opportunity to introduce to you a very good friend, Brother Ed Scrivens, who is a member of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress of Great Britain. Born in Wales, November 1921, he left there at the age of 14 to become an apprentice machinist in the English Midlands. He took part in the 1937 apprenticeship strike. In 1960, he became a District Officer with the Amalgamated Engineering Workers' Union and a member of its Economic Policy for the East Midlands in May 1978. Since September 1982, he has been a member of the General Council of the TUC.

ADDRESS BY EDMOND SCRIVENS
Fraternal Delegate, British TUC

MR. E. SCRIVENS (British TUC): It is a great pleasure and a privilege to be here among you in Toronto and to bring you warm fraternal greetings and best wishes of 10 million British trade unionists. Our membership may be a bit smaller than it was a few years ago, but the friendship that we have for the Canadian sisters and brothers increases.

British trade unionists are more and more aware that, if we don't hang together with the Canadian trade union movement, we will be hanged separately. It is easy to hang together with the Canadian trade labour movement. We always took on the Canadian Labour Congress as a great friend and a great ally and, during the last two years, we have had new reasons to be thankful. Your generosity during the miners' strike in Britain, in giving funds to provide relief for miners and their families, was outstanding and will not be forgotten by the TUC. I sincerely thank Dennis and the International Affairs Department for the energy with which they collected and transferred the massive aid which they channeled to us from your unions. I thank you sincerely for your solidarity.

In listening to your debates, if I was to substitute Mulroney for Thatcher, I would feel I was back at home. The British fraternal delegates at your last Convention talked about the vicious nature of the anti-trade union measures taken by the government in Britain. Well, the government is still vicious; the laws are still on the statute books and unemployment is still increasing. Cherished national institutions in Britain are under sustained attack: our national air service, our state education system, our social security provisions, each is at risk from the short-sighted economies forced on them by the government. We are seeing the weakening before our eyes as a result of being deprived of resources. We know the consequences for working people, for the unemployed, for the sick, for the elderly and for our children will be devastating. And on top of all that, the government is selling off wantonly to its friends, in the City and elsewhere, great sectors of British industry, and services built up through public enterprise and owned by the people.

This government picked out the trade union movement for extra-special treatment. Three major pieces of legislation during these past seven years have sought to weaken our organization, to severely restrict the right to strike, to divide members from their unions and to break the link between the unions and the Labour Party. Several of our unions have suffered severe financial penalties under the legislation and have been deprived of the means to defend their members. But we are beating the government at its own game. Public attitudes to the law are changing. It is seen by the public at large to be grossly unfair. Each union with a political fund is now required by law to ballot its membership about retaining it. Every one of the 39 unions who held ballots, obtained overwhelming majorities in favour of retention. And the ballots have helped to demonstrate that we are in tune with our members, though the Tory government thought we were not. Now some of the unions without political funds have balloted to set them up.

Britain is rightly famous for its National Health Service. We treasure it because it exists to provide free health care to everyone who needs it, regardless of their ability to pay. The government said that this Service was safe with it, but we have seen hospital wards being closed, services for the sick being withdrawn, and waiting lists for some operations getting longer and longer. Our members, many of them low paid, struggle to compensate with a selfless dedication for a highly inadequate funding of the Service. But the number of old and handicapped people is increasing, and this too puts added strains on an already overburdened system. We are campaigning to save the Service and we are determined to win that fight. We must win; that Service belongs to the people and they should have the best.

The British trade union movement, like the Canadian trade union movement and other movements around the world, wants to see our greatest asset, the talents of our children, given a high priority by government. In Britain at present, the government refuses to invest in either the fabric of our schools or in our teachers. The government's reaction to a dispute with the teachers is to turn towards bolstering up private education instead of recognizing the needs and objectives of the public service. The TUC is supporting teachers' unions in their efforts to stop the decline in educational standards and to force the government to increase investments in all parts of our education system, that would improve the system, and not only that, it would create jobs.

I hesitate to list the sins of the Tory government, I have not the time. Your Convention only lasts a week. I could go on about the cuts in the welfare state and about the large number of our young unemployed people who are forced to move from town to town every few weeks because they may only collect social security benefits to pay for lodging in any one place for a limited period of time. The white paper in which the government sets out its plans for what it calls reform of the social security system is an attack on every aspect of the quality of people's lives from the cradle to the grave. The accuracy of that statement is frightening. Amongst benefits to be scrapped are the maternity grant and the death grant.

British trade unionists have the courage, the strength and the determination that are needed to defend social provisions and turn the country into a place where people, once again, are more important than profits. We will be there when the miserable record of failure, division and the inequity of the Conservative government will stand condemned in the history books.

Our policies for public intervention to generate investment, both public and private, in new industries, in existing industries in the infrastructure, are well based. Most employers and politicians agree with them. Only the Prime Minister and the Cabinet totally disagree, while the rate of unemployment steadily increases from month to month, despite efforts to lower the figures; because the accurate figure in my country right now is about four million unemployed.

We come to give you the greetings and the pledge of solidarity with you. We know you have problems. We know, too, that you have the will and resolution to overcome them. We must work together where we can to change the direction of economic and political developments and banish the threats of nuclear annihilation, increasing poverty and starvation in the developing world. I am sure we can make a contribution in our countries and

we have an instrument like the ICFTU, means to co-ordinate our work effectively, to make our presence felt by the powers that be.

We owe this to our members. I am grateful for the opportunity to address this great Convention of yours. The British TUC can teach you nothing. I would now like to pay a special tribute to the contributions made by your women members. It is a lesson that we must learn in England too. Your women members have proved to me that women can speak with as much articulation and power as any man on any platform, when their cause is right.

I am sure your President will miss the feeling of solidarity and warmth which belonging to a great union tradition gives us, and I wish him and Claire every success in their new work. I too am near retirement from my own union. I know I shall miss it after a lifetime working with it, but I will not break off the links of friendship and support which are always the marks of trade union organizations. I shall always remember your hospitality to us this week.

When you return a government of your choice, have the patience to work with them and go the right way to give total justice to the people you represent.

MR. D. MARTIN (Executive Vice-President, CLC): Thank you Brother Scrivens. That is a good indication of why we have solidarity in Canada; we in fact learned an awful lot of it from the TUC. Our best wishes back to the TUC and I know that you will take a message to Neil Kinnock: "Get busy and put a Labour government in Britain."

Now, Bob White will introduce our special speaker.

FAREWELL ADDRESS — DENNIS McDERMOTT
CLC President 1978-84

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW, Canada): I appreciate the opportunity this afternoon to introduce for his farewell address to the Canadian labour movement, the President of the Canadian Labour Congress, Brother Dennis McDermott.

There comes a time in one's life, whether you are a local union steward, a shop floor representative, local union leader, staff or national leader, when you have to make the decision that you must step down. I am sure that the people that made those decisions ahead of today did not make them any easier than did Brother McDermott in the last number of months. There are a lot of people at this Convention who are here for the first time and I just want to take a couple of minutes to talk a little bit about Dennis' background before he gives his farewell address, because so many times in the labour movement, I think we just remember the last couple of weeks or the last couple of years.

Dennis McDermott came to Canada in 1948; went to work in Massey-Harris in Toronto; became a member of UAW Local 439, the local union that Brother Duff talked about yesterday, that used to have 6,000 members and is now down to about 38 members. He, of course, became active in the union almost immediately; and played a role that many of you have played: steward, editor of a local newspaper, very active in the education field. Then along with some others like Dan and Donna Hill, Kalmen Kaplansky and Eamon Park, he helped form the first joint labour committee to combat racism and was appointed by the then Director of the UAW, George Burt, to the staff of our union in 1956. In 1968, after George Burt left, in spite of the fact that I was in the other caucus trying to get another candidate elected, Brother McDermott was successful and got elected Director of the UAW. In 1968, he led the UAW through many, many important changes, many collective bargaining firsts; a great deal more autonomy for the Canadians within the international union; much closer working relationships with the political arm of the labour movement.

He also got our union very active in the peace issues of the day and made us a much more socially conscious organization. I remember very well when the kids were coming across the border of the United States trying to get away from being drafted into that insane war, there was one of the clear voices in Canada against the war in Vietnam: he was Dennis McDermott. There were two people in our international union at that time, on our international executive board, who were clear voices against the war in Vietnam, and it was not Walter Reuther; it was the then Secretary-Treasurer Emil Mazey and the other was Dennis McDermott. And I think he deserves a great deal of credit for that because it was not popular and we saved a lot of kids' lives by taking that position.

And I remember when the farm workers of California were dying in the fields in struggling for terrible wages, trying to improve their working conditions. Dennis McDermott marched with Cesar Chavez, not only in Toronto, not only before the CLC Convention and other conferences, but led a labour delegation to the vineyards in California to support the cause of Cesar Chavez and the farm workers.

He always, of course, was a strong fighter on behalf of human rights. I think one of his finest hours is not talked about much, because political leadership gets the most publicity, but the Quebecers will remember. When the Trudeau government brought in the War Measures Act, we had a Canadian Council meeting the weekend following that. The mood of the labour movement in Canada was not very much for human rights in those days because most people were concerned about what they thought was happening to our country. But Dennis McDermott said: "The issue here is the issue of human rights. You cannot lock people up in jail because they disagree politically, you cannot lock people up in jail without a fair trial." And our union, under his leadership, took a position against the War Measures Act.

He always understood that we had to have a strong national labour centre.

I have seen some things written about why certain building trades left the CLC. One of the reasons they left was they wanted block voting, the right to control this Convention by block voting and by bureaucracy. And Brother McDermott said: "We will have none of that. This Convention is unique. We want rank-and-file delegates. Even though they disagree with us, we want them at this Convention." He was very active in leading the labour movement to the first national work stoppage, the day of protest in 1976 against wage controls. Of course Dennis being elected as CLC's President in 1978 involved us in the parallel campaign, involved us, along with others, in terms of the largest demonstration against interest rates.

He led the Congress through the position of no concessions. Obviously one person does not do it alone, but he was that one person there to say that the labour movement was not going down the road of U.S. labour movement, telling workers they had to give back in order to save their jobs.

He said: "The workers need a union when times are tough and we have to stand firm. We should not just have the affiliates make that decision on their own." He said: "We ought to make that decision as a national labour centre and support the smaller unions." And I think that it is a great credit to him in doing that.

Dennis was instrumental in putting affirmative action in place in this Congress; not alone, with a lot of help, that is right. I do not know what the decision will be tomorrow but, as we sat down to try and discuss the politics of the top of the Canadian Labour Congress after Brother McDermott leaves, he was recommending a team in which we would have two women, one woman as President of this Congress, one as vice-president, two national union representatives, two international union representatives, two public sector union representatives, and two private sector union representatives. He understood the necessity to keep this

labour movement together and the role that women have to play, and the role that has to be played between the private and public sector.

So, as he reaches the twilight of his career, he is going to take on some other responsibilities. But let me just say on the question of affirmative action, he also put his money where his mouth was. He understood the struggle that women had in the workplace. He marched with the women in Fleck manufacturing. He not only marched with them, he encouraged the local union guys in St. Thomas and elsewhere to march there and stand shoulder-to-shoulder with those people when the police were there in hundreds. He also said to the Bank of Commerce: "If you want to take on the Commerce strikers, mostly women, a lot of single parents, if you want to take them on, then you sure are not going to starve them out because we are going to find some money to keep them on strike as long as it takes." That is real affirmative action.

Of course, he always played a strong role in international affairs, whether he was speaking out for the free trade union movement of Poland or whether he was calling for the overthrow of dictatorship in Nicaragua, or other Central American countries. He led the labour movement in many delegations around the world; I have been with him on a couple of those and he was always very proud of this central labour body. I just say to those people sometimes who are critical, that when you look at this Convention, you do not get delegates coming from China, South Africa, and other countries unless they believe that the leadership of this labour movement is reaching out to them.

Now it is fair to say that Dennis has been unusually controversial, but you always knew where he stood. He always believed you do not stick a finger up and test which way the polls are going to go and then you get in behind the workers and push them. He always said that when you believe in something, you have to get out front and lead it. He believed that it was the only way that you could make change. I think he would be the first to say that he was very fortunate, fortunate for having spent most of his adult life working full-time within a movement which he loves. He should have no regrets and I believe that all the delegates here wish him and Claire well in their new endeavours.

MR. D. McDERMOTT (President, CLC): Thank you very much Bob, and the son of a gun really was the leader of the opposition too, you know.

I would like at this time, before I get into my remarks, to introduce some members of my family, they are sitting over here.

First of all, the apple of my eye, my daughter Maureen; my son Patrick and his girl friend, Shirley Johnson; and the other apple of the other eye, my son Bill and his fiancée Sharon; and sitting over there with them, my good friend, good companion, my wife Claire.

Also at this time, because the opportunity does not arise too often, there were two women in my life, my good right arm, the person that has been absolutely indispensable in the last eight years, without whom I would not have survived, my secretary Joyce Jones.

I have sat here this week and listened to the debate, and read the comments in the press, many of whom seek to find cracks in the solidarity and the will and determination of this movement. The solidarity that we have here is being questioned by some of the media freaks and some of the academics and others. I know of no institution in this country that remains united through crisis, no other organization that matches the unity of this labour movement.

When the country was divided on the energy crisis and we saw bumper stickers saying "Let the Eastern bastards freeze in the dark," this labour movement did not let that divide them.

When the whole dynamic revolution was uppermost in Quebec and the demand for sovereignty-association potentially threatened a permanent division in this country, it was this labour movement that understood and made the accommodation and passed resolutions after considerable debates, saying: "we are brothers and sisters together and nothing divides us." And that is what we are all about.

I am proud of the fact that we spoke out on the War Measures Act. There has been a lot of retroactive judgments about that. You can scarcely find anyone that was for it, but if you remember back in the panic of those days, it was the labour movement that took the very unpopular, but now we know exactly right, position on the imposition of the War Measures Act.

I wondered last night what I could say to you today. Would I reminisce? Would I get sentimental? We had a dinner last night for our foreign guests and I put together some remarks for them. And it occurred to me this morning, why not use those remarks? Because I think it demonstrates very clearly that when you are speaking in the international context, as I was speaking last night, that the same is applicable to the domestic concept.

I explained to our foreign guests the structure of this Congress; the manner in which this Convention is run; the nature of the selection of the rank-and-file delegates to the Convention, who come from the offices and the factories and the work sites from all across the land; how the officers are elected by 3,000 delegates on the basis of one delegate — one vote, how the Executive Committee and the Executive Council together with the officers are charged with implementing, via a form of in-between parliament, the positions and the policies and the programs that constitute the work of this Convention.

I said to them the Canadian Labour Congress — and they know this to be true because they attend congresses of national labour centres all round this world — is unique, is different, is larger, perhaps a little more rambunctious, but it takes second place to no other national centre or any other national labour movement in this world.

The Canadian labour movement, I believe, despite our obvious shortcomings, despite our willingness to be self-critical, is a vibrant and an exciting and an energetic movement with lots of moral fiber. That's what it is all about too. And our principal task, I said to our foreign guests, is to bargain collectively on behalf of the people that we are privileged to represent, for wages, for benefits, from some of the largest corporations in existence in this world so that we can improve the life and the lifestyle of our people. But, I said, we are also a movement that recognizes very clearly that one cannot separate the economic from the social. It's impossible also to separate the economic and the social from the political.

And, by the same token, we also learned a long time ago that it is impossible to separate the domestic from the international. So it should come as no surprise to learn that economic activities, basic, fundamental, nevertheless dovetail with social action in the communities across the land and in the partisan political activity all the way from the federal to the provincial, to the municipal. I think Canadian labour, and I know it is recognized by the international trade union community, has demonstrated a compassion and a commitment to the total world human family, that we work actively, with other organizations and men and women of good will out there in the world community.

We perhaps have forgotten but it is not too long ago, when Somoza went down the drain in Nicaragua, the Canadian Labour Congress was the first agency in Nicaragua with two million dollars worth of aid; the very first. We happened to be down in Venezuela when it happened; we were Johnny-on-the-spot and we got in there. We also have a reputation in the Third World known as "no-strings-aid." The only string is that the money is spent to the program or the people for which it is designated.

When Brother Scrivens said that he could substitute his Prime Minister for ours, because the debate sounds familiar, the problems are familiar, that is true. And the one thing that we have in the world community of trade unions, is a very basic fundamental problem that is not the exclusive property of one nation or another, and of course, it applies particularly to the Western world.

But I say to our friends in the world community of trade unions that, even though we share a variety of languages, different historical development, cultures, and indeed ideologies, my experience shows that we have more in common that we have in difference, that we have a common thread of concern and commitment to people, the welfare of people. And we have a slogan, which we should repeat periodically to ourselves, that if what we do in our day-to-day activities is not somehow directed towards the betterment of the human family, then it is not worth doing.

The other slogan that we should repeat to ourselves, I believe — because I repeat it to myself because you get tested once in a while — is that you, at all times, afford to others the same degree of sincerity that you claim for yourself.

There is so much misery and poverty rampant in this world of potential plenty. The Western world is suffering crippling unemployment. Why? Because every human soul in this world needs a roof over their head? A fully belly of food? Few people around this world are saturated with the comforts of life that we can produce here and elsewhere. Many lack the comforts of life, like a refrigerator, or a motor vehicle or tractor. The common thread that runs through the international trade union community is to find the solution. Surely to God, if we can send rockets to explore the universe, we can use that same know-how to settle and deal with the problems of humanity.

It is a reality that there can be no peace in this world so long as so many people go to bed with empty bellies every night, throughout the Third World and elsewhere. There can be no peace in this world so long as the obscenities of dictatorships in Latin America and elsewhere continue to exist, propped up by the very people that should be bringing about their downfall. And there can be no peace in this world, my friends, so long as anachronistic colonial regimes continue to thrive in places like South Africa.

This then is the common agenda of the international labour movement. These are our common concerns and each of us in our own way, each of us to the extent of our ability, can contribute and, more importantly, co-operate.

That is why it is important that we, in the Canadian Labour Congress, come together every two years and dialogue in various other ways. It is very important that our friends in the international community come here so that we can break bread together and dialogue together, because we all know that we have the capability, we have the desire, we have the scientific know-how; we can, if we pursue our ideals with energy and purpose, leave as our legacy, all of us, in our lifetime, a world of bright sunshine. A world of clean air. A world free of racial and religious bigotry. A world free of the ugliness of violence and the insanity of war, a world of peace and a world of freedom, a world where people, and not profits, are the top priority, a world where a person will be judged by the depth of their character rather than the amount of wealth they have accumulated in their lifetime.

This is an emotional experience for me, I often wondered how I would feel when this moment arrives. I can tell you, especially the younger among you that have a lifetime ahead, that there is no greater measure of obtaining human self-fulfillment than toiling in the vineyards of democracy known as the labour movement of Canada.

And I read the poet Chapman, periodically, know the words by heart now. How do we organize? How do we mobilize? The message is very simple, we sing it every day at this Convention; "When the union's inspiration through the workers' blood shall run, there can be no power greater anywhere beneath the sun, yet what force on earth is weaker than the feable strength of one, it is the union that makes us stong."

I leave you certainly with sadness. I am going to miss you, but secure in the knowledge that you, all of you, will press upward and onward in improving the welfare not only of the human family of Canada, but the total human family. Peace and love and farewell. Thank you.

(Standing ovation)

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Dennis thinks he is emotional, what about the rest of us? You truly have given Dennis a clear message of the warmth and the thanks for all the things that he has done, on behalf of the working people of this country, on behalf of the handicapped, the disadvantaged, disabled, our native peoples, elderly, for the labour movement. He leaves a great legacy, brothers and sisters. I think it is one that we have not seen for many, many years. I think also that the fact he will represent the country, as the Ambassador to Ireland, is for us a plus. And it is true, the Irish will never be the same, but with the warmth, the credibility, the intelligence that he is taking with him and certainly with Claire, I know that he will always do a good job. Dennis, we are watching you and also if you need any help, you just look over that shoulder because we are going to be there, friend and brother, we are going to be there.

It is my privilege also to tell you Dennis, that there is a message from Lech Walesa wishing you the greatest of success, and of course his very personal thanks for what you have done for Solidarnosc and for democracy around the world. And let there be no mistake about that, brothers and sisters. I also know that there are numerous telegrams coming in to both you and Claire, not only about this day but about the days following your appointment. I think it is fair to say that the file that Dennis has, which is a happy file on that occasion, is a thousand times thicker than the file of the regrets and the damnations, because I think there are about three in that file. You see, it is a credit to the labour movement, it is a credit to all of us who really do know the Canadian people.

Dennis, I have a few people that would like to come up and give you something. The first one is going to be Matt Woodley, President of Local 2104, the Union of Bank Employees, London, Ont., main branch of the Bank of Nova Scotia.

MR. M. WOODLEY (President, UBE): Brother McDermott, the Union of Bank Employees owes the CLC, and yourself of course, a lot of gratitude for the support that you have given us. As you know, it is a long hard struggle, has been, and will continue to be. But thanks to you, we see the light at the end of the tunnel and we have a token of appreciation here, and of course we wish you all well in all future endeavours.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): They were out for a long time, that group. I would like to call Brother Joseph McLeod, of the Marine Workers' Federation.

MR. J. McLEOD (President, Marine Workers' Federation): I guess you all know I come from the Atlantic Provinces, the poorest part of Canada. On behalf of the Marine Workers and shipbuilding across Canada, who are all poor because the government took everything away from us, there is a frigate we are trying to make, that one is for you Brother McDermott, the other one is for your lovely wife. I also have a hat for you. There are two ties there brother; one tie when you are over there with the workers drinking, the other tie is when you are mixed up with the hobnobbers or whatever you want to call them, I do not know. That is for your wife. I also have something else. This is when you start drinking that good Irish whiskey, that is the first ship that will be delivered by one of the better shipyards in the world, if we ever get it finished. There is another one for your wife.

MR. D. McDERMOTT (President, CLC): Now you understand the source of my great joy, because where I am going in a couple of weeks, they are all like that over there.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Last week the Executive Council had a dinner for Dennis and Claire and I should tell you that there were many presentations made on behalf of the Executive Council and you. The Irish philosophy got pretty deep for a while, it is amazing how many people learn how to speak Irish after they have had a drink of Irish beer.

Anyway, Dennis, I want you to know that it was very important to this Convention that we take these few minutes and let you express in your own way to this Convention — you know he kept his language clean, did he not? — how you feel and also to make sure that they understand. They hold a very clear special spot in your heart and in Claire's, who is a union member in her own right. So we say bon voyage, we shall come knocking at your door one day, and you are always welcome to come back to this Convention and perhaps we will arrange that.

I request the Health and Safety Committee to come back up.

MR. W. STUART (President, UMWA): I tried a couple of times to get to this mike before the last couple of speakers. The reason was that some of the information that was brought to this floor regarding the British miners' fund that we campaigned to raise. I certainly took exception with the attempts to chastise the Executive Council for the efforts that they made. I was one of the people who initiated that campaign and there were a lot of other people involved, a lot of unions, but everyone of them was an affiliate of this Congress. They all got involved in different stages and in different ways in that campaign, including the Executive Council, and yes initially, there was some breakdown in communication.

A lot of that, I will take the responsibility for, because I am the guy who did not communicate properly with the Executive Council. Having said that, I spoke with Des Dutfield from the National Mine Workers' Union yesterday and he asked me at that time to thank everybody that was involved in raising that money. The only way that I could do that, is to thank the Congress, because all that were involved are members of this Congress, including the Executive Council. Brothers and sisters, I thin you for your effort and I congratulate everybody that was involved in raising nearly a half million dollars for the National Union of Miners in Great Britain.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I will now call the Committee on Occupational Health and Safety.

MR. N. COSNETT (Steelworkers): Point of privilege, Madam Chairperson. If we are speaking on the asbestos resolution, my point of privilege would be that the people take the same line as they were in before.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, the Committee is going to decide on what resolutions they are going to deal with.

Chairperson of the Committee.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

MR. C. GODBOUT (Occupational Health and Safety Committee Chairperson): The Committee has been dealing with the referral and I want to say that it has been very difficult for the Committee to come to a conclusion, but the Committee makes a recommendation of non-concurrence with the referral.

The reasons are that this question has been discussed among the Committee members a few times and the resolution, as proposed by your Committee, is a resolution talking about control and surveillance. The referral is talking about a ban, which we feel would be contrary to the principle established in the original resolution as proposed by your Committee. We feel that we have a reasonable recommendation in front of this delegation, so we are going back to the original substitute resolution as read this morning by our Secretary.

MR. L. LABERGE (President, QFL): Madame Chairperson, a question of privilege. As you know this is a vital question for us in Quebec. I ask that you delay the debate until tomorrow and consequently, I am now asking all of the Quebec delegates to immediately come to a caucus of Quebec delegates here, downstairs, in room 202-B, so that we can discuss the question among ourselves.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): In view of that, the Committee will now be asked to step down until we try to resolve the problem.

MR. J. MARTIN (Steelworkers): We cannot allow a division of the House of Labour. We are supporting the Quebec workers on the resolution but we are not supporting the suggestion that asbestos is safe. For somebody from the front table, and particularly for the Chair, to allow a bunch of delegates from any province to lead the House of Labour on an issue of asbestos is terrible, and I am asking you to call it to order now.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee will be back on, as soon as they can. You have to give them some time. It is a very critical issue, as you well appreciate. It is a sensitive one and I think that we have to give them some time.

So, I will now call the Committee on Social Action and Services. Please bear with us.

MR. D. FRASER (Steelworkers): I would ask how can we deal with any other resolution when part of this delegation has walked out to confer on another resolution.

If we cannot deal on this resolution because they have left, then how can we deal on any other issue that is coming before this Convention? Tell me why?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): With due respect, in the 20 years I have been going to conventions, there have been many delegations walk out to confer on resolutions and deal with those resolutions. So in respect to this situation, there is no problem with that one either.

I have now called the Committee on Social Action and Services. You will have your opportunity to debate whichever way you feel when it comes back.

Please bear with us, we have a lot of work to do at this Convention.

MR. R. BARRY (President, UE): It seems to me that your position on this question is rather ludicrous. 2,000 delegates of this Convention explicitly before lunch decided on how they wanted the resolution brought back to the Convention floor. You chose to bring it back this afternoon, and now you are saying the Quebec caucus are going to determine how that resolution is going to be handled not the people who are elected as delegates here to make the determination. I think your decision is wrong.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Under the rules of order, the Committee has the power to do that. They are exercising that power to try and resolve this problem; they have every right to do that. The Committee has asked delegations, whether it be this Committee or any other Committee, to try and resolve problems as serious as this and that is what they are trying to do. It is not a walkout of that delegation.

I would then call the Committee to deal with the Social Action and Services Report.

MR. B. DESROCHES (Steelworkers): Madame Chairperson, I do not know what all the uproar is about this proposal that is before the Convention. Firstly, I clearly understood the motion that was put forward was one of bringing the report back tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): That is right.

MR. B. DESROCHES (Steelworkers): If there is any criticism at all, it should be that the Committee tried to come forward this afternoon, not that it should be left over until tomorrow. I suggest that this Convention get on to the business that we have come here to do and quite quibbling amongst ourselves. We will get the opportunity to deal with this tomorrow. Let us not worry about when we are going to get it done.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you. Would the Chairperson of the Committee start his report please?

Brothers and sisters, it is quite clear that the brother that made the referral came up here at the conclusion of the noon hour session and said to me, will it be tomorrow? I said, as far as I know, it will be. We have a night session tonight, hopefully, we will all be here when the Committee has to meet. It is a very sensitive question, I ask you to bear with us on this.

Let us get on with the Convention.

MR. V. VADACCHINO (NUPGE-OPSEU): Madame Chairperson, I do not disagree with your ruling; however, when a point of order is brought up, I wish that you would rule such that the Committee has a right to withdraw any motion. Is this correct?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I did not say that, no.

MR. V. VADACCHINO (NUPGE-OPSEU): Well they stepped down, they have the right to do that, right?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): They have the right to go and have a meeting about it with the concerned delegates to this Convention. That is perfectly in order and that is what they are doing.

MR. V. VADACCHINO (NUPGE-OPSEU): That is right, that is why the other motion should have been ruled out of order. They have no point of order on that, this is perfectly legal, so let us carry on.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you. Point of privilege.

MR. D. McNABB (NUPGE-OPSEU): I would like to move that the motion that was on the floor being dealt with be tabled in accordance with the Roberts rules, where rules provide that if that was tabled, then the action that is being taken by the Committee is in order, then you would be able to go on with the next order of business.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Sorry, brother, it is out of order.

MR. D. McNABB (NUGPE-OPSEU): Madam President, in the middle of a debate, you cannot adjourn unless somebody tables it.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): There is no adjournment of anything. The Committee has the right to go and meet with the delegation on a question of great concern. The Committee has that right. It happens all the time in your own convention and you know that. Now can we get on with the rest of the business and I would ask the Chairperson to start.

SOCIAL ACTION AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

MR. A. KUBE (Social Action and Services Committee Chairperson): Before we go into the first composite resolution, I would like to draw to the attention of the delegates, on the second page of document 13, one change. If you go on the second page of the document and you go down approximately to the ninth line, where it reads right now "each percentage point by which the national unemployment rate" change the word "national" to the word "regional". With that, I would like now to commence.

Your Convention Committee has examined the resolutions in the area of Social Action and Services and wishes to report as follows:

In presenting them to you, we are trying to give priority to those resolutions that are directly related to current political debates.

The Committee therefore recommends concurrence in the following composite resolution on strengthening unemployment insurance to cover resolutions S-1, S-5, S-6, S-11, S-18, S-20, S-22, S-24, S-27, S-33, S-38, S-39, S-58, S-67, S-74, S-75, S-76, S-79, S-84, S-100, S-108, S-117, S-120 and S-129.

That composite resolution reads as follows:

"WHEREAS the federal government has done much to weaken the unemployment insurance:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED to:

1. Introduce a uniform 10-week qualifying period and to do away with all the specific requirements for entries into the workforce, re-entrance of repeaters;
2. Lengthen the maximum 52-week benefit period by a further 13 weeks when national unemployment rate is above six per cent;
3. Increase the benefits level from 60 per cent of earnings to 66⅔ per cent;
4. Extend UI coverage to part-time workers for all hours and all earnings;
5. Eliminate UI repayment for those whose incomes are above a certain level because UI is a universal insurance program not an income-tested program;
6. Eliminate the two-week waiting period;
7. Allow workers who have suffered a real loss in wages due to reduction in working hours to qualify for UI benefits;
8. Eliminate the seven or more consecutive days of unemployment before initial claim;
9. Pay maternity benefits to workers directly involved in a strike or lockout;
10. Have claim benefit to be determined on the average of the highest week's earnings during a re-qualifying or qualifying period;
11. Simplify the administration and eliminate needless complexity so that the program can be easily understood and accessed by unemployed workers;
12. That persons 65 years of age and over be eligible for unemployment insurance benefits;
13. That the new Program for Older Worker Adjustment, which replaces the Labour Adjustment Benefit Program, provide a minimum benefit level of two-thirds of individuals' earnings and indexed to the cost-of-living and that benefit be available to older workers in all industries; and
14. That the federal government introduce an income support program for workers who have exhausted unemployment insurance, who are able and willing to work, but cannot find employment."

I move that substitute resolution and it is seconded by S. Wallace, a member of our Committee.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence of the composite resolution as outlined in document no. 13.

MR. J. TUBMAN (UAW, Canada): I am in favour of the proposed composite resolution. The Committee itself has dealt with a very complicated area of legislation and a large number of resolutions in this area. Most of the points in the motion really do not need great amount of debate for us in this Convention, for I am sure many of us in this room have been trying to survive on unemployment insurance benefits, going back to the early 1980s.

I come from Brantford. We suffered terrible losses in the agricultural implement works in that city; White Farm equipment, as many know, will no longer exist, throwing out over 1,000 workers.

The point I would like to highlight centres around point 9. I understand that it refers to Resolution 58, maternity benefits to workers directly involved in a strike or lockout. Prior to this resolution coming forward, I talked to a member of the Committee

and I recognized that there was no specific resolution put before this Convention to deal with Section 44 of the Unemployment Insurance Act, the labour disputes section. I hope that will give us some latitude. Section 44 is a very detrimental section of the Unemployment Insurance Act for us as workers.

This legislation is not only entrenched in the act but is also supported in the regulations, but, more devastatingly, is covered by the previous decisions of the umpires in Canada going back to the late 1940s.

I had an opportunity, after a nine-month strike, to face the problem being raised by Section 44, in that the workers involved in that strike were not entitled to unemployment insurance benefits until 85 per cent of the pre-strike workforce had been reinstated. Attempting to appeal this decision quickly, I was confronted not only with the regulations, the act itself, but the jurisprudence, which not only said 85 per cent of the pre-strike workforce, but also the requirements that 85 per cent of the pre-strike quality of work be attained. And the list went on and on. I do not wish to have this resolution or these resolutions referred back to the Committee on this issue; I urge that the Committee give some deliberation and consideration to an expansion on point 9 to really address the problem with Section 44 of the Act.

MR. W. ZANDER (B.C. Council of Carpenters): I have to concur in the resolution and I hope we can get the kind of momentum going to stir them up in Ottawa. The penalties that are being brought down by this federal government against people who are unfortunate enough to have to collect unemployment insurance are absolutely and totally unacceptable. On March 16 in the Lower Mainland in B.C., they determined that repeaters who, up until then, only had to get 10 weeks in order to re-qualify, now, had to have to get 16 weeks insurable earnings in order to re-qualify.

This means, as far as the building trades workers in the Lower Mainland, that none of them will bloody well re-qualify under these circumstances nor will any other seasonal workers.

By this change in Sections 17 and 35, people in our industry are going to have to go straight to welfare, if they can get it. In fact, there is no unemployment insurance, it is a misnomer. I hope that the trade union movement — I have no doubt we are able to do it — will follow the program, as laid out in this resolution in all 14 points; and will do a real job of defending the earnings that people are entitled to under UIC.

MS. E. DUNN (HREIU): I am particularly glad to see items 7 and 8 allowing workers who have suffered a real loss in wages, due to the reduction in working hours, to qualify for U.I. benefits and to eliminate the seven or more consecutive days of employment before initial claim. My union represents a lot of chambermaids and laundry workers in hotels.

These people are scheduled to work on the basis of occupancy. One of the things the employers do is schedule them to work one day today, not tomorrow, work the next day, maybe there days of work a week. They will not schedule them on a lay-off for seven days so that they can get their unemployment insurance. They expect these women to pay the rent, pay their utility bills, put food on the table and to pay all their other expenses on two or three days a week during slow periods.

The reason they do this is that they want those women to work sometime in the future when the business picks up, and they are afraid that if they lay them off, they will find other employment or just not come back to work. This is a real curse in the industry which I represent and that is why I am particularly glad to see this resolution with these items included.

MR. C. PASCUCCI (PSAC-CEIU): I am a person who works for unemployment insurance, at a Canada Employment Centre. I think if we look at this resolution just isolated by itself, it is okay at the start, but it is not going to greatly improve the basic problem that is in the unemployment insurance system. I think that there are a couple of things that are missing.

For example, there is no reference in it in terms of the moneys on separation for vacation pay and severence pay and pension income, which probably should be done under this section. They should not be considered moneys on termination, so people would be entitled to their benefits from the time they are unemployed. It is a very basic right that should be in here.

There are two things. First try and destroy some of the myths that are involved in unemployment. For the past period of time, the practice of the government has been to restrict entry, make it more difficult for people to qualify and receive unemployment insurance benefits. Why does that happen? It is because unemployment insurance is not only treated as a socio-economic policy and program, but also treated as a political program as well. This means politicians make the decisions on who is going to qualify and who is not going to qualify by legislation, and for us to make real change in the unemployment insurance system, that has to change.

Now my component, the Canadian Employment and Immigration Union, and the Public Service Alliance made a proposal in briefs to the Forget Task Force: unemployment insurance mostly is paid from premiums collected from employers and workers, that in itself it can be a self-sufficient fund. Therefore, a Crown corporation should administer the unemployment insurance fund. That would free unemployment insurance from political interference so that we can treat unemployment insurance as a socio-economic policy and not a political policy. That should be included; because if we are only dickering with certain parts of an act, we are always susceptible to political interference and political change.

The other missing element is the question of who does the work in the employment centres in terms of processing those claims. Many of you may be surprised but there are cutbacks in almost every employment centre across Canada in terms of dealing with processing the claims and in counselling the unemployed. That has to be addressed as well, in terms of helping the unemployed.

If we are only looking at tinkering with amendments to the Act, we are not solving the basic problem, and that is unemployment insurance is a right.

MR. A. KUBE (Social Action and Services Committee Chairperson): Delegates, if you look in the document, you will find that the points are covered in another resolution further on. I also want to inform you that the Congress presentation to the Forget Commission called for an arm's length relationship in regard to the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

MR. A. HERSHKOVITZ (UFCW): I think everyone in this room has supported it. The importance of this resolution to me is simply this: that we should mobilize our membership to fight for the enactment of these things.

Unfortunately we have resolutions that are passed with little attention paid to them. Now the Chairperson of the Committee has mentioned the fact that there is another resolution dealing with the question of cutbacks and I would like to deal with that because it is part of the overall problem.

The actions on the part of the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the actions of the federal government and attempt to cut back on all the social benefits that we have fought for and won; could that be the beginning of concessions being made by Mulroney, in relation to the free trade program? Our people have to become aware of the fact that that is a deliberate policy on the part of government to put the burden of the economic difficulties that we are faced with onto the shoulders of those least able to pay.

It is not so long ago where we saw the government endeavouring to cut back on the benefits for the pensioners. And to the

credit of those men and women, they successfully fought back and stopped the government from taking that action.

The other day we read about the moneys taken out of the pension funds of the Dominion Store workers, the millions of dollars that were taken away from these workers, which in effect meant a wage cut to the workers of Dominion Store, especially at the time when they were being fired.

The question of unemployed workers who receive pensions and severence pay is another attempt along that very same line. People who have earned vacation pay during their working period, people who have earned severence pay during their period of work, workers who have earned pensions as a result of years of toil and labour; there is now the decision to take that away.

We have a responsibility to the thousands of unemployed, the thousands who will be unemployed and those who are retiring who will be denied unemployment insurance if they retire earlier than 65.

So I urge the delegates to this Convention not only to vote for and accept this resolution but I suggest that we do more. I suggest that we go out into our plants and carry the fight in such a manner that we will be able to block any attempt to take away from the workers and from the people of Canada, things that they have fought for.

MR. W. RANNACHAN (UFCW): I am taking advantage of this con mike to call the question.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called. All those that concur with the question being called, please raise your hands. Opposed to the question being called. It has been called.

Now, I will put the question, the question of Committee's recommendation of concurrence in the composite resolution dealing with that list that has been read. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please show. Any opposed. Motion is carried.

MS. S. WALLACE (Social Action and Services Committee Secretary): Resolution S-90, the Committee recommends concurrence.

"WHEREAS mandatory retirement has, generally, worked to the advantage and benefit of workers; and

"WHEREAS many unions have established mandatory retirement ages through collective bargaining and in their constitutions; and

"WHEREAS the elimination of a uniform retirement age opens the door to managerial harassment of older workers; and

"WHEREAS the question of mandatory retirement is intimately linked to the right to adequate pensions that would enable retiring workers to maintain a standard of living comparable to what they enjoy during their working years;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress oppose any legal ban on the continuation of mandatory retirement; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC continue to struggle for public and private pension reform so as to ensure that every Canadian worker will be able to retire with an adequate retirement income relative to his or her pre-retirement income, fully indexed against inflation."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence; seconded by A. Kube.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence on Resolution S-90.

MR. J. ROSE (President, CUPE): A couple of months ago, the federal government announced that for reasons of individualism, for reasons of the Charter of Rights, they would be moving to abolish mandatory retirement in the federal sector. A lot of people rejoiced at that news at first blush, thinking: "Well this gives me or the people that I work with the opportunity to spend another couple of years after the age of 65 if I want to, would that not be nice?"

It was only on reflection that alarm bells began to go off. I want to mention a couple of them because I think that it is very important that this resolution be strongly endorsed.

There are two basic problems with legally abolishing mandatory retirement for reasons of individualism. The first is that if people are to be judged as individuals, the only basis that employers will have — and note it will have to be the employer who makes the judgment, based on their own criteria — on which to judge a person as an individual, will be their performance. There will then have to be systems of testing to judge individual competence to carry out the job. If that is to happen, that will have to happen before age 65, it will have to happen at various points during the person's working life. Of course, it cannot happen on the basis of the Charter of Rights only at a certain age, because the whole point of this policy would be that people cannot be judged on the basis of age. That opens the door to a very dangerous concept that we in our movement and our predecessors have rejected.

The dangers of means-testing performance of workers is clear. It will lead to judgments that will mean that people will be compulsorily retired at age 45, 50, 55, 60, as well as creating a situation where there will be a handful of people who will work beyond 65, no doubt about that.

The idea that we have established, that a person has the right to work to age 65, will go down the drain. Now compulsory retirement after means-testing of a person's competence to perform the job is bad enough on its own. Of course it raises the second problem, and that is the problem of pensions.

We obviously do not have adequate pensions even now for people who retire at age 65, the typical age across this country. Imagine what it will be like for a person who hurts her back working in a hospital and is compulsorily retired at age 48 after paying into the pension plan for, say, 12 years. Not only will that person not have an adequate pension if indeed the person had access to the pension at age 48, but, on the basis of the present rules, typically that person would have to wait until 60 or 65 to receive the pension and by then, it will not even buy a package of cigarettes.

So, for both of these reasons, the abolition of mandatory retirement is a very dangerous concept. It is typical that the arguments that are invoked in favour of it are similar to the kinds of arguments that are invoked in favour of individualism leading to free trade, individualism leading to deregulation, individualism leading to privatization.

We believe in making social choices, whereby there may be some rough justice for a few people at age 65 but if it benefits millions of workers as a result of making that social bargain, then we support it. I urge the delegates to think seriously about what this means and to support the recommendations of the Committee strongly.

MR. P. STIER (CALFAA): I stand in opposition to the Committee's recommendation of concurrence with resolution S-90. The first "Resolved" requires that the Canadian Labour Congress oppose any legal ban on the continuation of mandatory retirement. We, the members of CALFAA, will impose such a legal ban only once the desires which are expressed in the second "Resolved" are attained. 80 per cent of our members, women, oppose mandatory retirement. We have already fought with our airline employers to lengthen the working time of our members since, with most of our airline employers, age 60 as the mandatory retirement age.

Now we have to attain age 65. The reason for that is that many of our members, 80 per cent of them to be exact, were denied the right to participate in employer-sponsored defined pension plans until 1966. Therefore, many of our members will never attain the full benefits of 35 years of service in a defined pension plan. Sure, there were offers to buy back-service years, with high interest; many of our members cannot afford a buy-back. Therefore, we, in CALFAA, have maintained that it is an individual's choice to continue to work, based on health and on the individual's ability to work, not by mandatory age, a magical age that now says you are too old to work because many times, we are too young to retire.

I believe that the resolution was written by brothers with no consultation of our sisters and I urge you all to oppose the Committee's recommendation of concurrence.

MR. R. GINGERICH (CBRT & GW): I rise to support the recommendation of the Committee of concurrence in Resolution S-90. The proposition is based on two or three points.

Number one, it is based on the proposition that provisions must be made for adequate retirement incomes for all workers and all Canadians; number two, a retirement income must be large enough in relation to the pre-retirement income to ensure the maintenance of a standard of living; number three, that retirement income must be indexed to ensure that it does not erode with inflation and the passage of time.

The vehicle to achieve those things is first of all through the public pension plans, the Old Age Security and Guaranteed Income Supplement and the Canada Pension and Quebec Pension Plan.

Secondly, there must also be legislation to ensure that private pension plans have to provide certain standards as well.

The position on mandatory retirement is not that every worker should be forced to retire at age 65, but rather than there should be no legislated ban on the mandatory retirement age. We say specifically that no union should be prevented from negotiating with an employer to establish a mandatory retirement age and if that organization thinks the mandatory retirement age should be 70, 65, 60 or 55, I say that that bargaining union has the right to make that decision themselves.

Secondly, I would say that no union should be prevented from enacting provisions within its own constitution that are acceptable to its members, enacted in a democratic way that provides for a mandatory retirement age. The whole proposition, we think, on this idea about getting rid of the mandatory retirement age is based on a myth and I think it is a very dangerous myth that workers would really have a choice as to when they want to retire. We believe that far more harm, insecurity, intimidation and violation of human rights would occur if mandatory retirement was banned, as employers use intimidation, harassment and concealed discrimination get rid of workers at, or before the age of, 65.

In conclusion, I would ask you to consider the possibility that, when workers can be employed beyond the age 65, it would give a Conservative government an opportunity to delay the payment of the Old Age Pension.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I do not see anyone else at the microphones on this particular resolution. I, therefore, will call the vote. The Committee recommended concurrence on this resolution. Those in favour of concurrence? Those opposed? The motion is carried.

MR. W. JEWERS (Social Action and Services Committee): Resolution S-104, the Committee recommends concurrence:

"WHEREAS the $100 billion in trusteed pension plans in Canada represent a powerful economic and social force; and

"WHEREAS for the most part these funds are being invested without regard to the economic and social objectives of the workers to whom they belong; and

"WHEREAS the overwhelming evidence is that these objectives can be met without sacrificing the financial integrity of the plans;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:

1. The Convention endorse the goal of organized Canadian workers, through the labour movement, achieving greater control and direction over the investment of pension funds so that, consistent with the financial integrity of the plans, pension funds are invested to further the economic and social objectives of organized Canadian workers; and
2. The Convention direct the Executive Council and urges affiliates to provide resources to assist the efforts of affiliates and central bodies to secure this goal."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence, seconded by A. Kube.

MR. G. MOWATT (NUPGE-BCGEU): The public sector employees in British Columbia unfortunately are not permitted to have control of the investment portfolio of their pension funds by legislation. In spite of this fact, however, in 1980 members of the B.C. Government Employees' Union walked off their jobs and rallied throughout the province in attacking the B.C. government's amendments to the pension legislation that would have set us back even further than we are now. As a result, we not only got rid of those amendments, but we also won the right to have a member on the Advisory Committee for investing of the billions of dollars in our pension funds. In addition, we also have a fund set up to index the pensions that we have now won for all our pensioners. It is at the Advisory Committee that our union will continue to fight for having the money in our pension funds to be invested in economic and socially acceptable ways.

MR. R. WILSON (Steelworkers): There is a tremendous inadequacy in our pension plans across this country today. For example, there has been the abuse of the Dominion Store pension plan in our own area in Niagara Falls. There has been the abuse of these funds, the Carborandum of Ohio Brass and several others. Our dollar was worth a dollar some 20 years ago and today it is only worth 38 cents when we go to collect these pension moneys. Again these pension funds are not available to our next of kin, our wives who have earned these moneys as much as we have, who have kept the home fires burning. We do a service to our companies or to our industries if we kick the bucket before the age of 65.

We have a great deal to be concerned about. We talk about Japan and its ability to produce. The Japanese worker at the age of 60 now gets $60,000 American cash in his hands at retirement age. If we live to be 150, we will never obtain that kind of money. In Italy, in Germany, after 25 years of service with an industry, you can walk around the city streets like a country gentleman, because you have the subsistence of survival. But in this country, there is a great deal to be done, in the area of pension plans. My brother spoke on the Canadian National retirement fund, I wonder how many of you know here that the Canadian National retirement fund earned $1.8 billion last year, more than the profits of the Canadian National Railroad itself; yet again, it has never kept pace with the indexing of our inflationary trend here in Canada.

MR. W. CLARK (TWU): There are two issues I would like to deal with on this. First of all, there is no criterion even for jointly trusteed plans to ensure that the funds are used in any ethical manner.

On the other hand, there is no evidence that investing these funds in those areas that are socially undesirable give any better rate of return than investing them where they can do some good. So we would like the Congress with the affiliates to take a good

look at a policy of ethical investment for trusteed union pension funds.

The other area, that we think is very critical is that at the end of 1984, there were $100 billion in assets in trusteed pension plans in Canada. This has become a very serious problem for us because when you get to be a trustee on these plans, you find out what the hustlers are doing with our money. The money managers and the stock brokers move this money back and forth, make money on every transfer they do, and it does not seem to increase any benefit for the plan members.

There is another area that we think is critical and we would like the Congress to work on. The recent changes to the regulation of pension funds has raised the amount that a pension fund may invest outside of this country, from 10 per cent of the assets to 20 per cent of the assets, a total of about $10 billion. The people in B.C. that have got control of our money, spent a billion and a half dollars to dig a hole in their own bloody place. I do not know any of the linemen that I worked with, that have a grade 12, that would be that stupid! But we have to give them our money.

We think there is enough money in union workers' pension funds to start stabilizing employment in our country, creating new employment; in places like British Columbia and the East Coast, there is some there to start economic development.

MR. C. ANDSTEIN (B.C. Federation of Labour): The issue of control of pension plans is an important one. It is not as flashy as free trade, it is not as critical as the anti-apartheid fight or the struggle on behalf of Central American workers, but it is the control of our money, control of our pension plans and it is part of the same struggle.

Right now, there is a $100 billion in trusteed plans in this country; there is the same amount in public sector plans. What is happening to that? In North America today, 60 per cent of stock ownership of equity capital is owned by our pension plans, by our money. We do not control it, we just own it; 40 per cent of the debt capital in this continent comes from pension plans. By the turn of the century, two-thirds of the equity capital in Canada and United States will come out of our pension funds.

So it is our money that is propping up Canadian and American businesses. And what are they doing with it? They are screwing us. They invest it in South Africa; the invest it in defence industries; they invest in nuclear power plants; they build non-union construction projects; they invest it in Third World countries and dictatorships, low wage countries to get products so that they can import them into Canada and take away our jobs. They are using our money to take away our jobs and to destroy our unions. We have to stop it. Why have we allowed it to happen? We have allowed it to happen because we bought the myth that capitalists do it better; the myth that we, as trade unionists, do not have the expertise, do not have the knowledge to manage our own money, our own wages, our own funds. Pensions are nothing more than deferred wages. We negotiate them, in most cases we pay for them. They are there to look after workers when we retire. Now let me ask you, who do you trust to look after you when you retire? The bosses who are now managing the pension plans? Or the people you elect, the trade unions? I put my faith in trade unionists.

The other myth being perpetrated by the right wing is that we cannot manage; that socially responsible, ethically responsible pension plans cannot make money. The evidence shows otherwise. Right now in the United States, there are a number of pension funds, investment funds, that use ethical and socially responsible screening processes and targeting. They do not invest in companies that deal with South Africa, they do not invest in companies that are tied in with the defence industry, they do not invest in the nuclear power industry, they do not invest in companies that have bad union relations. The rate of return on those funds is as high or higher than all of the other funds that do not have these ethical or socially responsible screenings.

So we have to take charge of our funds, so we have to put the interest of trade unionists, workers and the communities in this country first. We have to use that money to develop projects that create employment, that create wages, that do not create profits for American and Canadian corporations. Sisters and brothers, with a couple of hundred of billion dollars, we could do a lot for workers in this country.

I urge you to support this resolution here but more importantly, when you go back to our local unions and to your provincial federations of labour, start to put together the same type of programs that we are working on in British Columbia to take control of our plans.

MR. R. MARTIN (NUPGE-OPSEU): Every once in a while, you hear the person before you say just about all of it and that brother had it exactly right on. Because when it comes right down to it, organized money is organized power and organized money can also deliver one really important thing, and that is social justice. We have that ability within our hands and that resolution at the end of it talks about the components, it talks of the individual unions doing something.

I am proud to say that our union is working at doing something; pensions are one of our key issues.

Now let me tell you one small horror story of what happened to us inside of a pension fund. I know about it because I sit on a Consultative Pension Committee and we consult about a fund which amounts to $700 million, but all we do is consult. A few years ago, interest rates were high. We can all remember when they were 18 per cent, 20 per cent, 21 per cent and when we went out and we were on the march up there on Parliament Hill. So we went to our Committee and we said: "Let us lend some of the money in this pension fund to our fellow members, two per cent under the market rates, let us bring them down. We are not saying give them eight per cent mortgages, we know what problem there is, somebody will turn around and say you are not making an adequate return, you are killing my pension. Let us give them some advantage, with some of the money." And they said, "You cannot do that, because you are not maximizing the returns in this plan." So we said, "Let us see what you are getting on the money." Now you know what they said to us, the people who were the trustees of the plan, "Oh, we do not want to let you see it." We said: "It is our money and if you do not let us see where that money is being invested, tell you what we are going to do, we are going to run down to the *Globe and Mail*, we are going to run down to the *Star* and we are going to say 'Crook'."

Now, I tell you, they changed their minds really fast and we started looking at exactly what they were doing, during the time of real economic hardship. They were lending some money out to big business for 30 years at 10 per cent; for 30 years at 10 per cent, would you like to have a deal like that? Now you know that it is not available to you. They were lending some money out to certain businesses in which I would say there was some question as to who was behind those businesses. Some people would say some of them were involved with organized crime, I do not want to say that. So we took a look at that and I will tell you how they defended all of those economic judgments because they were not maximizing the returns. Of course they were not maximizing the returns, our members would have been paying 16 per cent, 17 per cent which was high enough but they were getting about 10 per cent of 11 per cent on an average. And they said to us that that was the best of their judgment at the time.

If we could not do better than what they could do, then we should not have been sitting in the room with them. I will tell you something we can do better. I do trust my brothers and sisters of the labour movement because I know 99.44 per cent of the jails, but I think I could find a banker or two or a lawyer or two inside.

MR. L. GERARD (Steelworkers): In the industries that I am fortunate enough to represent in Northern Ontario, in the mining sector and the basic steel sector and the manufacturing, one of the things that we are finding is that the need for us to try and take control of our own pension plans is growing all the time. Resource sector companies are using the surplus from pension plans for investments, using the surplus to pay off corporate debts, because we do not have access and any control.

The government in the Province of Ontario is coming forward with some pension reform amendments on the matter of access by unions, and on the matter of access by workers, and on the matter of having information so that we can take control of the plans, so that we know when they want to take out a surplus.

The only thing they have proposed is that, prior to a company taking out any money from a pension plan, they should inform the union. We have adopted in our union the principle that a pension plan is a deferred wage. When we go to the bargaining table and negotiate a pension plan, that is a wage that we put aside for our older workers when they retire. We have taken the position that it is our money. The employer certainly has not adopted that position and he has had the help of the provincial and federal governments in developing legislation that prevents us from getting meaningful access.

The largest pool of capital in this country is pension capital. That capital is used against the workers, it is used to fund plants that will operate in direct competition with union plants, it is used to help fund the military race, it is used for all the wrong reasons when it should be used to really protect the livelihood of workers when they get older and have to retire.

I cannot stress strongly enough the importance of us having good debates and having unanimous positions on the issue of pension and again taking this fight forward. Until the workers get control of the pension plans, those plans will be used against us till we get control of the pension plans.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called. All those wishing to put the question, please show. Those opposed.

I will now put the question. The Committee recommends concurrence in resolution S-104. All those in favour. Any opposed. Motion is carried.

MR. A. KUBE (Social Action and Services Committee Chairperson): The Committee also received 13 resolutions dealing with the future of public pension programs, therefore the Committee is moving concurrence in the following composite resolutions to cover resolution S-9, S-12, S-13, S-19, S-29, S-45, S-47, S-52, S-56, S-80, S-81, S-101 and S-123.

"WHEREAS the majority of today's retirees rely on the national public pension programs (Old Age Security, Canada Pension Plan and the income-tested Guaranteed Income Supplement) for most of their retirement income; and

"WHEREAS the benefits under these programs are still not sufficient to eliminate poverty among the elderly or to allow retirees and their surviving spouses to maintain their standard of living in retirement; and

"WHEREAS company pension plans are still available to only half of all workers and one third of women workers, and suffer from other shortcomings; and

"WHEREAS early retirement should be encouraged — particularly during periods of high unemployment;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress continue to pressure governments for the following as immediate objectives of pension reform:

1. Substantial increasing in all public pension benefits including a doubling of Canada Pension Plan benefits;
2. Equal sharing of Canada Pension Plan benefits between spouses and the full protection of the living standards of surviving spouses; and
3. Making all OAS, GIS and CPP benefits available at the age of 60 to people who are involuntarily retired due to unemployment and ill-health; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC press the government of Canada to establish a 'Bridge to Retirement' program that would make it easier for older workers to retire during period of high unemployment. The 'Bridge to Retirement' program would have the following characteristics:

1. It would make benefits equal to OAS and CPP benefits available to older workers before age of 65 when the unemployment rate in CEIC regions rises above six per cent;
2. The age at which the bridge benefits are paid would decrease — to a minimum age of 60 — by one year for each percentage point by which the regional unemployment rate exceeds six per cent;
3. To be eligible for benefits, workers would have to agree to leave the paid labour force;
4. The 'Bridge to Retirement' program would be paid for out of general government revenue.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress point out to the Government of Canada that it will not tolerate any tampering with the full indexation of public pension benefits, such as the May 1985 proposal of the Minister of Finance to partially de-index Old Age Security benefits."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence; seconded by S. Wallace.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence of the composite resolution as outlined by the Chairperson. On the question.

MR. W. PATERSON (Calgary Labour Council): I regret getting up to a con mike on this question, because, overall, I agree with the substitute or composite resolution. However, I have been to many conventions of the CLC and it was always my understanding that we were aiming for full pension benefits without penalty at the age of 60, voluntary retirement at the age of 60 with full pension without penalty. Although this composite resolution addresses that question, the one thing which compels me to stand at a con mike is on the top of the second page of document 13, where it says: "Making all of OAS, GIS, and CPP benefits payable at age 60 to people who are involuntarily retired due to unemployment and ill-health," etc. The part that I resent in the Committee's composite resolution is the wording "involuntary retirement due to unemployment and ill-health".

When I see the resolutions which this composite resolution deals with, it starts off at S-9, 13, etc., I note looking through the resolutions book that S-29 talks about a voluntary retirement without penalty at age 60, S-56 talks about voluntary retirement at age 55, S-80 talks about voluntary retirement without penalty at 55, and finally S-123 taks about voluntary retirement at the age of 60. The age of 60 was a policy of this Congress for years and years. I am amazed that the Committee would come back, chop up these resolutions to the extent that they are destroying the concept which we fought and discussed years over, and discussed by putting in those words, "involuntarily retirement due to unemployment or ill-health".

I think that I behooves this Committee to listen very carefully to what I say and I urge the Committee to reconsider this. I realize that we cannot refer it back and I also regret that at this time of night we should discuss an important matter like this. But surely, the Committee could take into consideration all of these other resolutions which I mentioned, which had nothing to do with involuntary retirement but to unemployment, had nothing to

do with involuntary retirement benefits because of ill-health, and probably they said voluntary retirement either at age 55 or 60 without penalty. And this is the only reason I am opposed to this resolution the way it comes back by this Committee.

MR. L. ERLICHMAN (IAM): Certainly in the last four conventions it has not been the policy of the Congress that full public benefits be paid out at age 55 or 60. So the section at the top of page 2 is in fact an addition to Congress policy, as far as I am aware. That being the case, I stand here with a certain amount of déjà-vu.

As long as I have been coming here to conventions, we have been in a pension reform phase and right now we are getting pension reform so-called at the federal and provincial levels based on something called federal/provincial consensus. Unfortunately, that federal/provincial consensus is a business consensus, it is not our consensus. It is a kind of minimal improvement, in terms of the regulation of the private pension system, and the core of our proposal for improvement will include everyone having the choice to go out at age 55, with full and adequate benefits. I do not know whether we are within haling distance of that, but these proposals and this business consensus that is coming forward now does not include the crucial parts of our proposals, the substantial expansion of the public system. With respect to the private system, there is a major gap with respect to indexing of benefits, and that gap leaves the substantial opening for employers to withdraw large sums of money from pension plans.

We are running very late here. I do not want to talk much longer. I would encourage delegates not just to support this resolution, but to go back and do the education job at the local level to make sure that the governments that we have do not get away with saying this is pension reform for now and forever, and we would handle all the problems. The consensus that they are talking about is not a real consensus, it is not a workers' consensus, and we have to go out and work and educate and make sure that the real reform starts to happen.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called. I am going to test the house. All those in favour of the question being put, please show your hands. Opposed. The motion is carried.

I will now put the question. The Committee recommends concurrence with the composite resolution as outlined by the Chairperson. All those in favour of the Committee recommendation please. Opposed. Carried.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sister Carr, could you tell us when this Committee will be returning to continue with the report.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We are going to try and get them back as quickly as we can but we have several Committees that have not even been on the floor yet. So bear with us, we are going to try and get the Convention business finished. I now declare the Convention adjourned until 7:30 tonight.

The Convention adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1986
Evening Session

Executive Vice-President Dick Martin called the Convention to order at 7:43 p.m.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON: (Mr. D. Martin): The first item on the agenda this evening is our Tech Change Committee and I will call upon the Chairperson of the Tech Change Committee, Brother Pomeroy.

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

MR. F. POMEROY (Technology Committee Chairperson): I will ask Roxie Baker, Secretary of the Committee, to read the first resolution.

MS. R. BAKER (Technology Committee Secretary): We will begin with resolution T-9. This resolution has been amended and I will read it with the amendment:

"WHEREAS many of our members work in caisses populaires, credit unions and banks; and

"WHEREAS automatic tellers are being installed almost everywhere; and

"WHEREAS we have little or no control over the implication of such a technological change;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the delegates attending this 16th Biennial Convention of the Canadian Labour Congress encourage their members as well as their acquaintances to continue to deal wherever possible with the employees of the caisses populaires, credit unions or bank branches during business hours; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the delegates attending this Convention sensitize their unions, their locals and the people around them to use automatic tellers only outside the business hours of the caisses populaires, credit unions or bank branches."

I move concurrence of the resolution as amended; seconded by F. Pomeroy.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): A motion of concurrence on the resolution as amended. Are there any speakers? Hearing no speakers, all those in favour of the motion of concurrence raise their hands. Opposed. Motion carried and so ordered.

MR. H. WAGNER (Technology Committee Member): We move to Resolution T-1.

"WHEREAS technological change in the hands of employers means replacing workers with machines; and

"WHEREAS the resulting increases in productivity results only in increased profits at the expense of jobs; and

"WHEREAS some of the new technologies can be hazardous to workers' physical or mental health;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress support the efforts of affiliated unions in their struggle to have a decisive say in the introduction and use of new technology, with the aim of preserving jobs and improving working conditions, including reduction of hours of work, and ensuring that the workers share in the benefits of tech change."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence; seconded by F. Pomeroy.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): A motion of concurrence.

MS. D. WOOD (BCGEU/NUPGE): As I look around the Convention floor, I must say that I am very distressed at the number of delegates that are here to listen to the debate on this very important issue, an issue that is going to be facing each and every one of us. If it has not hit you already, it certainly will in the future. The concern of this labour movement must be to insure that we have an informed membership on what high technology will mean for them. Unless we educate our own membership on this issue, we are going to lose the battle.

As part of my union's plans to raise the visibility of technological change, we surveyed 10,000 of our administrative services' members to determine the effects of high technology on their work and to discern their level of awareness on the impact of this complex issue. We were both amazed and distressed at

the results, some of which were: 92 per cent of those who responded stated that technological change had been introduced to their work site; 66 per cent stated that there was no worker input or consultation at any stage, let alone at the implementation stage; 48 per cent reported an increase in stress with many reporting even higher level. For example, workers in our social services department sufffered a 70 per cent increase in stress; 67 per cent did not understand the ergonomic factors; 85 per cent of those who responded had experienced changes in their organization of work.

With the results of this survey, our union recognized that we had to attack technological change on two fronts. Firstly, we struck a union-wide Technological Change Committee whose mandate was to develop language for upcoming negotiations which would affect 35,000 of our members. Secondly, we produced a comprehensive position paper for our convention, to create an awareness amongst our members. The first step is an on-going pro-active campaign. We cannot accomplish the goals stated in this resolution — protect workers' physical and mental health, employment, and have a decisive say in the introduction and use of new technology — without unions having an educated membership in the workplace. Such members can recognize the early warning signals of the insidious process which will result in the jobs being replaced by machines; will know when their jobs are being fragmented; will realize that their productive levels are being monitored for disciplinary purposes and that their privacy is constantly being invaded by surveillance.

We cannot wait for governments to do this job for us, we must act on, not just discuss, existing CLC policy. If we are truly to share in the benefits of technological change, and have control over the work environment, we require members who will not accept the imposed change but rather have a vision of how things could be; but resolve to ensure that technological change is designed to enhance workers' rights and dignity and not just to benefit the employer. I would also have preferred the use of the phrase "workers define tech change benefits" rather than "sharing tech change benefits". I have been involved in this issue for the last six years; in fact, our local organized around the issue of technological change and I view it as the major threat to working people and trade unions in this country, moreover around the world.

I was surprised by the very few resolutions submitted on the subject because I attended regional and national CLC technology education sessions this year and thought that some new policy directives on tech change would be brought forward at this Convention. But I was informed that the directives from the sessions I attended were too late to be included. The number of resolutions however are immaterial, because, in reality, tech change issues pervade every aspect of trade union struggles ongoing today. If free trade, deregulation and privatization are the corporate blueprint, then technological change is the corporate pen; it underwrites most of the issues already identified at this Convention. Besides deregulation, free trade and privatization, it is the impetus behind increased use of part-time labour, contracting out, electronic monitoring; it threatens job security, equal pay for work of equal value, occupational health and safety legislation, you name it.

Viewing tech change in isolation is asking us to write our own trade union obituary, one that fits well in the corporate blueprint. In the past, I have been very critical of the position that states we cannot fight technological change; we have to be a part of it, part of progress. I ask you, how can we be part of a barely disguised plan to eliminate the very forces of production, the working people, and the trade unions we belong to? Unfortunately, we are already a part of that plan. We have been since the first industrial revolution and we have yet to develop an adequate strategy to eliminate it once and for all.

This resolution echoes the voices of workers over a hundred years ago, workers who eventually resorted to violence and were condemned as lunatics in the history books. I would like to honour these workers because their analysis was correct; they only lacked an alternate program of action. I still object to any position which puts us in a reactive stance fighting a rearguard attack. I also urge the delegates to turn around and ask not for a share in the benefits but to define the benefits of technological advances; to be the authors of our own blueprint where technological change is implemented in appropriate ways to serve us and our society. I also call for support from our leadership. We need the tools, the education and the actual design of technologies in order to put forward these alternative programs.

I used the word "urgency" earlier because our world has suffered and is suffering greatly right at this moment at the hands of corporate and governmental interests, which have been responsible for the most inappropriate technologies of them all, nuclear reactors. I am referring to the devastating accident at Chernobyl, the worst but probably not the last of these disasters. Our fight to gain control over high technology means not only our jobs but our very lives, and the lives of our children. I hope to God we are not too late.

MR. P. LAWRENCE (UTU): I would like to just bring you up to date on the situation on the railways. Inasmuch as we have been subjected to tech change and the forerunners of that term on the railway since the early fifties when they were changing from steam to diesel, so we have been subjected to this over and over again, it is not exactly new. But there has been a tremendous amount of new innovations, as they call them, introduced in this last several years and one was mentioned on Monday here, I believe. It was suggested that the Canadian Pacific Railway wanted to run boxcars a thousand miles without a proper inspection. Well, I have got news for you, they want to run them from coast to coast without inspection now. That is because they claim that it does not require a proper inspection between here and the other coast.

The other thing is that you are going to be brought up to date on the caboose issue. One of the things that we are already having to deal with is the reduction in crew size, again as the railways claimed, due to tech change which is really a misnomer. When I started on the railways 25 years ago, we had as many as six members on a train and a train was only somewhere in the region of 6,000 feet, 59 cars. Now we are dealing with trains that are up to 9,000 feet long, as much as 16,000 tons and we now only have three members on that crew. I let you draw your own conclusions. But the point is that, due to claimed technological change, the reductions are taking place and it is our contention, and many other communities' contention, now that tech change in fact has not replaced people. The tech change that is claimed to have replaced people is not doing the job it is supposed to do. There are still many breakdowns, many false readings and so on; and without going into all the technicalities of it, these innovations are just not measuring up to the claims of either the railways the companies that are selling the railways on these technological innovations.

So, a point that I would like to bring out is that we have to guard against the assumption that tech change is automatically better. It is not in a lot of cases; it does not even do half of the job of the people that it is claimed to replace. We have to constantly challenge them on this question. These innovations have to be tested over a long period of time and thoroughly proven that they will in fact replace people before they are allowed to, because otherwise you are running to situations such as this example. We had a train leaving a yard where there were two people in it. One of the people on that caboose had a heart attack. Fortunately, the other member of the crew was able to stop the train, have it back up into the yard, and have that person taken to a hospital. And to this day, that person is alive. Had that person been the only person on the caboose, and then

had a heart attack, that would have been the end and nobody would have known that he had had a heart attack until maybe two or three hours later. But this is all in the name of technological change. So, I urge the delegates to not only support this resolution, but to pay attention to the things that can spin off from tech change, things that are not always apparent when you first are presented with the problem.

MR. R. FISHER (Steelworkers): I would like to thank the Canadian Labour Congress enormously for the amount of work they have done in trying to make us and the affiliates aware of what technological change is. There is not any question that one of the primary things that has to occur within our affiliates is that we have to become aware of what technological change is.

Four years ago, the local I belong to had 100 more people at work than we have now. Today, with 100 people less, and working three shifts rather than four, we are producing just as much potash as we did then, and it has not occurred through the microchip. The point is that there are other innovations, there are other technological changes than the microchip. We are not talking entirely of high technology. Once you have a definition — and this is where I particularly thank the Canadian Labour Congress for the work they have done — once you have a definition of what technological change is, you see it all over the place.

And the definition is really very simple: it is simply a change in methods, process or machinery. And if you think about those three words for a while, you will realize that there has been an awful lot of technological change taking place in your place of work and it has not come about because of the microtechnology that is no larger than your thumb nail.

The other aspect of the technological change is the insistance of our employers that we have to implement all those changes in order to be competitive and get the efficiencies that come along with it. It is really nothing more than getting into the same kind of Ronald Reagan's, Margart Thatcher's, Brian Mulroney's deregulation and the whole Conservative philosophy. Our Canadian employers are telling us those things and, at the very same time, the employers in Britain are telling the British workers that, unless they bring in these changes, that they will not be efficient, they will not be able to compete in the international market and, of course, they are saying that they will not be able to compete with the Canadians. And it goes around and around and around.

Of course, the Japanese employers tell the employees that if they do not do that, they will not be able to compete with the Americans and so on. They, the employers, the multi-nationals who are our employers, for the most part, are using technological change in that way against us throughout the world. It is absolutely essential that we not only become aware of the effects of it here, but also become aware of how it is being introduced and how it is being sold and to the workers in the rest of the world and the populations of other countries as well for that matter. But there certainly is that element, worker against worker in the name of efficiency and competition.

The other aspect of it is that there is absolutely no way in the world that technological change, in whatever form, is creating jobs. There is no way that the introduction of technological change will make more jobs available, and I do not suppose that there is any need to emphasize that fact here. But the fact of the matter is that, while jobs are being eliminated, while tax revenues to our governments, be they municipal, provincial or federal, are dropping because of the unemployment rate, our employers are making enormous profits through the use of technological change. The fact that the Chrysler Corporation made $2.5 billion in fiscal 1985 or '84, whatever it was, a sum of money greater than the total corporate profits in the whole corporate history up to that point, is obscene. What we have to do, while we have to become more aware of technological change and its effects, is to be able to capture at source, that is through wages, the profits that these companies would otherwise be stealing. And that has to be done in the Canadian Labour Congress.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): The question is being called. All those in favour of having the motion put, raise their hand. Opposed. Carried.

All those in favour of a motion of concurrence, raise their hands. Opposed. Motion carried.

MR. J.C. PARROT (Technology Committee Member): The Committee recommends concurrence with resolution T-2 as amended and which reads as follows:

"WHEREAS many workers' jobs are being eliminated due to technological change; and

"WHEREAS many new jobs are not being created for our youth coming into the workforce due to new technology; and

"WHEREAS the present legislation to cover workers under federal jurisdiction is inadequate;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress petition the federal government to enact laws to:

1. Give a minimum of one year advance notice to workers before new techonology is implemented;
2. That all workers will be retrained for positions before new technology is put in the workplace; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC lobby the federal government to establish a special department to study and monitor the effects of technology in the workplace; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC continue to provide educational programming with the goal of training more union members to monitor the introduction of technology in the workplace and ensure its proper introduction."

I move concurrence in the resolution as amended, seconded by F. Pomeroy.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): A motion of concurrence.

MS. F. SOBODA (Steelworkers): Sometimes we do not pay all the attention to this issue that we might because we think it only happens to someone else, whether clerical workers with computers or welders in a plant where they put in robots, and that is not the case. Technological change is not only machinery, it is also procedures and processes. The corporate argument and in many cases the academic argument still is that no, no, no, technology does not displace people, technology creates jobs.

In part, they are right. It creates a very few high level, highly skilled jobs, for which much of the training still is not available in Canada.

I have had members in my plant that have been on layoff since 1981, that is almost five years, and they think they are on layoff because of the economic downturn and the disaster that our plant has become. But, in fact, if we did get orders and the plant started working again, at least one-third of my union membership would never be back to work because of the installations of technology and different facets that have been put there.

Education and collective bargaining are the only ways you can truly combat this; at the bargaining table with the company to talk about notice for technological change is to talk about training our people for the new jobs that exist. Management trains management people. You have to hope that you can explain clearly enough to the arbitrator; and, if the arbitrator will not buy the academic argument that technology creates jobs, that your people should have been the ones trained to do the work. The companies' argument is always the same thing; "well no, it is not the same job, because you see now we are doing it by computer or some other method" and they try to argue it is different. It is not different, it is just being done differently.

But there is even a more insidious thing happening with technological change. Employers are using the introduction of technological change to bust your union. They call people together under the guise of "let us talk about what we are going to implement, let us talk about the new training, let us talk about the new technology we are going to have here."

And they get the people; the people are afraid for their jobs to begin with, they are afraid they will not be able to handle the new jobs. They are scared of the training and management sucks them in saying "well okay, you will only do this much and management will do the other 50 per cent, and you will not have to worry about it". Some people get into that problem. They establish what really is a bastardized "quality of work life" program based on talking with your membership about the introduction of new technology.

There was a meeting held at my plant not very long ago and the company did not tell me about it, the members called me. When I went to the meeting, the first thing the guy holding the meeting said was: "What are you doing here?" "Well as president of the local, I think I have a right to be here." He said, "Yes, but this has nothing to do with the union, it is about the new computer." Then he also said that if I was going to sit in on the meeting, he did not want me to take any notes. So, everybody in this room knows what that means. We ended up with an almost two-hour debate over whether or not the union had a right to be there and whether or not we had a right to take notes. Now we stayed and we took notes and we are going to file a grievance on what was said, but that is the most insidious part of it; they play on people's fears, they try to give them bullshit hoping they will be too afraid to file a grievance if their job will not be there.

I stand in support of this resolution and I ask everyone to work on this. It is one of the most important problems facing us today.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Seeing no further debate, all those in favour of the motion, raise your hands. Opposed. Motion carried and so ordered.

MR. F. POMEROY (Technology Committee Chairperson): The next resolution is Resolution T-3.

> "WHEREAS it has been predicted that micro-technology will displace many federal public service workers; and
>
> "WHEREAS it is also stated that this new technology will create new jobs with different qualifications; and
>
> "WHEREAS there is no requirement for the federal government to ensure that those federal public service workers made redundant by technology are retrained and qualified for the new positions;
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress demand the federal government negotiate in good faith with federal public service unions collective agreement language concerning training and qualification for positions for employees displaced by technology."

I move, seconded by a member of the Committee, R. Baker.

MR. J. PACHILICK (PSAC, Environment Component): We can sit and talk about technological change, and yet many times the unionists are the first ones to push the new machines, and the new computers that come in to our offices, because that is the way to go and if we do not do it, we are backwards.

I know this happens in our locals and this happens in the workplace. Everybody is afraid to be backwards, if they do not spend their money on the new computers. On the other hand, the employers are not willing to spend the money on retraining people; they would sooner lay people off. That is certainly a fact right now in the federal government and particularly with Mulroney's policy. Therefore, we should be pushing for "no layoff due to tech change". Many of us unionists do not have the guts to stand up and tell that to our people because they are afraid that we are going to be called backwards.

For many years, I was a weather technician in Ottawa but the computers have been in Montreal since 1965. We have replaced the computers there twice now, we have spent millions and millions of dollars doing that. We have also replaced about 3,000 jobs, those jobs just are not there anymore. Yet there were no layoffs in this particular case, because it was done slowly. It just goes to show you that it can be done without layoffs.

We should continue to demand that the employer provide the money for retraining. There were 3,000 jobs wiped out, there were no layoffs, there were retraining programs put in my particular department. But right now, computers are coming very quickly and we must ask the employer to give us retraining.

MR. H. CLARK (CPAA): I would say that there is something happening with technological change. The most insidious of any of the technological changes that I have seen is the instance where you have small plants, small post offices, where there is absolutely no automatic machinery, absolutely no computers but they are laying people off because they say the work load has moved from these offices, where in fact it is a direct effect of technological change in the major plants. We have to fight in order not only to protect the large places that are directly affected with technological change. The unions and the CLC must make sure that management does not and is not allowed to use technological change as a layoff, insisting on its lack of work simply because there is no automatic machinery or computers in the small plant.

This has to be very closely watched by all of us. Training is a must because these bastards do not care how they can do it, they are going to get rid of as many workers as they can.

We must make sure that we keep each other at the Congress informed of what is going on in any organizations and protect those areas where there are no automatic machines in.

MR. D. GALVIN (CUPE): Technological change is one way of management conning employees so that they can destroy the fiber, the cohesiveness and the unity of unionism at its base root, which is a better way for our management to attack unionism. You are going to have your membership asking you, what is the union doing for us?

There are only so many people that are going to be involved in technological change and the others are going to say: What am I doing? Where am I going? Am I going down the tube? Am I going to have a job? You have to get something within your collective agreements at the base root and one point that was brought up was training. But let us realize one thing management is here to erode unionism and one way of doing it is using technological change. So we had better be on our guard.

MR. P. WRIGHT (PSAC-UPCE): We should not be afraid of technological change, it is inevitable. We are not in the 18th Century in England, when people went around destroying machines.

We do not want to destroy the machines, we simply want to share with the employer the benefits that these technological changes bring to us.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Hearing no further debate, all those in favour of the motion of concurrence, raise your hands. Opposed. Motion carried and so ordered.

MS. R. BAKER (Technology Committee Secretary): Resolution T-5.

> "WHEREAS the Canada Labour Code provides inadequate protection to workers confronted with technological change; and
>
> "WHEREAS the implementation of technological change changes often has dramatic negative effects on the economic and social fabric of Canadian communities;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress press for an immediate overhaul of the Canada Labour Code designed to place workers and the communities in which they reside in firm control of decisions as to the selection, timing, and implementation of technological changes".

And I move concurrence, seconded by F. Pomeroy.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): A motion of concurrence. Seeing no speaker, all those in favour of the motion of concurrence, raise their hands. Opposed. Motion is carried and so ordered.

MR. H. WAGNER (Technology Committee Member): Dealing with resolutions T-6 and 8, we have a composite resolution in which the Committee recommends concurrence:

"WHEREAS technological change is allowing the same amount of work to be done by fewer workers, or the same amount of work to be done in a shorter period of time; and

"WHEREAS long-term solutions are required to deal with the thousands of working people displaced by technological change; and

"WHEREAS the right of every person to have a job and a decent standard of living is more important than increased productivity or increased profits;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress continue to pursue education and action programs to achieve reduced work time, in keeping with the 1984 Convention policy."

On behalf of the Committee, I recommend concurrence, seconded by F. Pomeroy.

MR. M. DOESBURG (Iron Workers): I wish to speak to resolution T-6 which calls for a shorter work week as a solution to the unemployment resulting from technological change. The "whereas" states that long-term solutions are required; however, it clearly implies, the way I read it anyway, that a shorter work week is only a stop-gap measure.

I would agree. It is becoming increasingly clear that the fact that mass displacement of industrial and office workers will greatly increase, as microchips and robots cause increasingly serious contradictions between society's capacity to produce products and the ability of a population ravished by unemployment to consume them. It may well be that a planned economy under democratic ownership, public ownership and democratic control in the long run will prove that the only solution that can provide full employment.

Resolution T-6 also calls for the Congress to endorse an educational program for achieving the shorter work week. You know, the more things change, the more they stay the same. One hundred years ago this year, workers fighting for the shorter work week was an issue around which May Day, the international working class holiday, was established and it is an issue now. On this May Day celebration tomorrow night, we will deal with this and other vital issues. That May Day celebration may well prove a part of the educational progress that this resolution calls for.

I understand that speeches dealing with the subject of tech change and other elements of our present economic crisis will be dealt with.

MR. J.C. PARROT (Technology Committee Member): I would like to bring to the attention of the delegates the fact that the Committee was very careful in checking what were the policies of the past before we dealt with our recommendation. Up to now, except for one, most of the resolutions have been more or less confirming the existing policies. In this case, in the "Be It Resolved", we are saying that the CLC continue to pursue education and action programs, to achieve reduced work time in keeping with the 1984 Convention policy. We wanted this to be very clear, because what we adopted in 1984 is that the CLC has to make a public campaign in favour of the shorter work week to create jobs in this country. That was the decision we took at the last Convention.

Monday, when we adopted document 18, we said to ourselves that we were renewing that policy and making sure the wording we used in that rededicated ourselves to the fight for a shorter working time.

I feel we have to be consistent, and the next Committee that is going to be here tonight also has a resolution dealing with reduced working time. Sometimes different Committees deal differently with the same issue. In this case, they are saying that "Congress will continue its efforts towards reducing working time but must do so in light of the realities of the time." That is on the third page of the report of the Organization Committee, and I am very concerned with this, for we do not agree. We have agreed in 1984, we have agreed on Monday that we were going to do the same thing, we got the resolution off the floor that is in line with those policies. I hope the Organization Committee that is coming next will review their recommendation on this one, not so much on the resolution that is in the book, but on the rationale that they have used by saying we shall do so in light of the realities of the time.

Well, the reality of the time is that there is unemployment in this country and we have to do something about it. The reality of the time is the workers in this country sometimes have to take on certain struggles. The resolution we adopted at the last Convention was to make sure that we were going to go public and initiate that campaign.

In the last round of negotiations in our union, we had the opportunity to show to the public that it is possible to force an employer to create jobs. It is also possible to go to the public and show the importance of that and get their support. I am sure that if we really put our energies to it and show the public the importance of the reduced work time we are going to get a lot more support that we think; so then the realities of the time will be we will get the public with us.

MS. J. DAWSON (Hospital Employees' Union): Point of information. I was wondering if the Committee could tell me why they changed the "resolve", specifically where they left out "with no loss in pay and a longer paid vacation and work statutory holidays".

I heard that with reduced work week in the explanation for 1984, but what happened to the "no loss in pay" please?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Can the Committee respond to that?

MR. F. POMEROY (Technology Committee Chairperson): Yes, the answer to that is that the 1984 policy that we adopted was a more comprehensive policy and it included that position so we felt it was better to refer to the '84 position than to limit ourselves to those points.

MS. J. DAWSON (Hospital Employees' Union): Pardon me sir, did it also include then the paid vacation and the statutory holiday?

MR. F. POMEROY (Technology Committee Chairperson): Yes.

MS. J. DAWSON (Hospital Employees' Union): Thank you.

MR. E. HOOGERS (CUPW): The remarks of Brother Parrot are directly in line with the comments that I wish to make on this resolution.

Of course, I am glad to see that this resolution has come forward for adoption. Sometimes I wonder just what it is that we are doing here at the CLC Convention year after year after year passing policies that have to be reaffirmed two years later. Unfortunately, the reality is that the policy statement that was passed in 1984 has not been implemented with the degree of energy of

consistency that I think would have been helpful to unions such as my own that have been carrying on a fight around the question of the shorter work week. I want to emphasize again the point that was raised earlier about the inconsistency which appears to already be before this Convention. It was mentioned that the next Committee is going to introduce a resolution, which is in spirit totally in opposition to the resolution that we have before us here. I just want to read a little bit that resolution because I think it drives the point home. That resolution O-15, which perhaps we will be considering here tonight or later on in the Convention asks the CLC to "work with its affiliates, labour councils, and federations to develop a co-ordinated bargaining and political agenda centered on shorter working time . . ."

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Brother, you are talking about another resolution, can you talk on this one please?

MR. E. HOOGERS (CUPW): Indeed I can brother. The resolution that I am speaking on right now directly impacts on the resolution we are discussing here. In fact, it is another resolution which is going to be addressed by this Convention, which will directly undercut what the impact of this resolution is.

What is the point of passing two resolutions which cancel each other out? The fact of the matter is that the resolution that is coming forward later on this evening has to be looked at very carefully by the delegates, because what it is saying is that the reality of the times means that we can no longer carry on the campaign that we dedicated ourselves to carry out in 1984. I think that the reality of the times as well is that, even more now in 1986 than in 1984, the question of a political agenda which raises issues of reduced working time is one that is absolutely important for this Congress to carry out.

I am in favour of the resolution that is before us. I am saddened that we have to bring back to this Convention a resolution which has not been acted on since 1984. I hope that when we go from this Convention in 1986, that not only are we going to see the situation where a few affiliates who decide to take up the issue of shorter working time are going to be supported after the fact, but that shorter working time really becomes part of the political agenda of the Canadian Labour Congress. And it takes a leadership position in urging affiliates towards the direction of making that a central point in their collective bargaining.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): The question is being called.

All those in favour of the motion of concurrence, raise their hand. Opposed. Motion carried.

MR. J.C. PARROT (Technology Committee Member): The Committee recommends concurrence with resolution T-7 to cover T-4, as amended to delete the words "within the company" in the second "resolve".

"WHEREAS it is apparent that the introduction of technological change in the workplace will displace many workers; and

"WHEREAS this displacement will add to the already crisis unemployment levels; and

"WHEREAS there is no legislation at this time to ensure that those persons made redundant by technology will receive retraining to ensure employment;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress demand that the federal and provincial governments enact legislation for mandatory employer-paid retraining of all employees made redundant by the introduction of technological change; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that legislation require the employer to retrain the employee for another position."

I move concurrence, seconded by F. Pomeroy.

MR. R. HIEBERT (TWU): I would like to talk on the second resolve which apparently is supposed to take in the concerns of resolution T-4. Doctor Suzuki spoke at one of our conventions about three years ago and he told us that the two groups, that were the worst groups that you could possibly get in charge of introducing new technology, are in control of it.

First, we have the corporation whose sole interest is to develop higher profits; the second is the politicians who go around spouting off technological clichés and technological buzz words but have no idea what they mean.

With respect to centralization, we have been having a problem for quite a number of years and we have had to clean up the mess of a lot of these programs. We have had to deal with family breakups, nervous breakdowns and even suicides. Workers in some of these small communities are getting centralized into larger communities in Vancouver, Kelowna, Prince George, and the smaller communities in British Columbia are dying. We have places like Williams Lake where the two biggest employers in town are UIC and welfare. And in towns like that, people cannot sell their homes, and, of course, when they move to the larger places where one of our brothers phoned the real estate company, they would not even send somebody out to look at his house.

When I look at resolution T-4, I hope that it covers this. It says that the Canadian Labour Congress will seek legislation which would protect workers from being displaced through automation. Now these workers are getting displaced and the idea of seeking legislation is not something that you can just go to the government, ask for and get. We have been working on programs since the early seventies to try and get community support to keep workers in town. In 1980, B.C. Tel. announced that they were going to move workers out of Cranbrook; there were 65 operators' jobs and they were centralizing them to Kelowna. We called on the CRTC to hold hearings in Cranbrook; we were successful.

They held them there and we managed to keep the office open. But just last year, after the new technology has been already added in there and after they had received government grants to put it there, in 1982, and this year in September, they told us they were going to close that office down. So we started another public campaign. We announced in the community of Cranbrook and the surrounding area that we were going to have a town meeting and that we were going to discuss jobs and keeping these telephone jobs in town. We invited everybody. We had about 300 people come to that meeting. We had the city council there; in fact we had it co-chaired by the Cranbrook and Kimberly mayors.

Well, it was a real success. The city council backed our position, they wrote to government officials, to the CRTC and they put together a program to try and force legislation to keep those jobs in town.

I think that we have to do more of this. You have to show those politicians that there are votes involved. I think the CLC should take a more active role within the communities in getting these community groups together to fight for legislation that will help the workers out.

MR. H. GREENWOOD (Steelworkers): It was my intention when I came to this mike to refer the resolution back but I think it would suffice to ask the Committee if they would consider that the last resolve reads: "BE IT RESOLVED that the legislation require the employer to retrain the employee for another position with no loss in earnings".

I think that it speaks for itself.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): The Committee has lost that gist. Can you come up and talk to the Committee please and tell them what you are putting forward.

MR. H. GREENWOOD (Steelworkers): I am talking about no. T-7 the last resolve.

It reads at present: "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that legislation require the employer to retrain the employee for another position", in that correct?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Yes.

MR. R. GREENWOOD (Steelworkers): Then I am asking that the Committee take into consideration the addition of the words to that resolution which would read: "for another position with no loss in earnings".

I think it speaks for itself and inasmuch as we are saying it is all right for companies to retrain people for other positions, but we do not want them to retrain a person who is earning a job rate to say $12. an hour for a job that only pays $6. an hour.

That is the point I am trying to make.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Okay, fine. Can the Committee respond to that?

MR. F. POMEROY (Technology Committee Chairperson): Yes, I think the Committee could go along with that recommendation, that modification.

MR. H. WAGNER (Member, Technology Committee): I might add, for the brother's information and for the rest of the delegates, our union has a contract which says simply that the employer cannot dismiss the employee or otherwise reduce their rate of pay. It is the employer's problem to find them training and alternate employment within his organization.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Okay, that was a sharp way of referring it back without referring it back.

MS. E. CLUNE (CWC): Most of the other speakers that have spoken on tech change have covered a lot of the points I was going to make. We cannot stop tech change but we must find ways to deal effectively with it. Looking around the Convention this evening, I remember what a hot issue this was two years ago.

People this evening seem a little impatient about the debate on this subject. Companies are very clever in introducing tech change. Right now in Manitoba, with the Manitoba telephone system, we have two programs in progress. One, the company has a management consultant firm in, doing what they call a corporate effectiveness program.

At the same time, we have the offices that have not yet been switched to the VDTs, being switched. Many of these offices are in small towns, the people are very concerned about their jobs.

I will not take too much of your time but I think it is important that people do not become complacent about tech change. It is still going on, you cannot stop it; you have to find effective ways of dealing with it. In bargaining, it is one of the most difficult things to get any handle on. I think it is important that governments are lobbied, not only to have companies retrain employees for work within the company but also if necessary, outside that company.

MR. J.C. PARROT (Technology Committee Member): Resolution T-7 as amended:

"WHEREAS it is apparent that the introduction of technological change in the workplace will displace many workers; and

"WHEREAS there is no legislation at this time to ensure that those persons made redundant by technology will receive retraining to ensure employment;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress demand that the federal and provincial government enact legislation for mandatory employer-paid retraining of all employees made redundant by the introduction of technological change; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that legislation require the employer to retrain the employee for another position with no loss in earnings."

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): I see no other speakers at the microphone. Those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence in resolution T-7, as amended? Oppose. The motion is carried. I will dismiss the Committee with thanks for a job well done. I call now upon the Organization Committee.

ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

MR. J. BUCHANAN (Organization Committee Chairperson): We have been charged with handling resolutions O-1 to 0-34 which are contained in Document 11. We have also been asked to deal with an Emergency Resolution no. 2.

The Organization Committee met to consider resolutions O-1 to O-34 and wish to report the following:

The first resolution O-1 deals with the issue of raiding.

The Committee is in full agreement with the concept that all affiliates of the Canadian Labour Congress should abide by the provisions of its Constitution. The Committee views raiding as a serious and unacceptable practice. This resolution, however, casts aspersions on some large unions, without being specific, which in itself is not in line with trade union principles.

Therefore, your Committee recommends non-concurrence in Resolution O-1. Seconded by R. Bezo.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): A motion of non-concurrence on resolution O-1, is there any debate? Hearing no debate, all those in favour of the motion of non-concurrence raise their hand. Opposed. Motion carried and so carried.

MR. R. BEZO (Organization Committee Secretary): Resolution O-2 and resolution O-5 deal with the issue of a national consumer boycott against the Canadian Tire Corporation.

The Canadian Labour Congress has an established and accepted policy for dealing with requests for national consumer boycotts; a main prerequisite of which is that the request must come from the ranking officer of the union making the request, accompanied by an outline of the supportive action the union intends to take to promote the boycott.

Since resolution O-2 and O-5 deal with the same subject matter and are in conflict with established and accepted policy, your Committee recommends non-concurrence in both resolutions.

I so move, seconded by J. Buchanan.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): A motion of non-concurrence in resolutions O-2 and O-5. Seeing no one on the mikes, all those in favour of the motion of non-concurrence raise their hand. Opposed. Motion carried and so ordered.

MR. R. CASHIN (Organization Committee Member): Resolution no. O-3 deals with the issue of independent unions and encouraging them to come within the Congress structure.

Your Committee in considering this resolution were mindful of the procedures established at the last Convention, the fact that it is not simply a British Columbia problem and that solidarity has done a great deal to enhance the lot of labour.

Your Committee therefore has amended the resolution to bring it in line with these facts. The resolution will now read as follows:

"WHEREAS working people in Canada and their unions are under attack and it is more important at this time than at any time in our history for working people to band together to

protect the rights and institutions that protect and make responsive our society; and

"WHEREAS tens of thousands of Canadian workers are in unions that our outside the maintstream of labour and are more vulnerable to attack;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress continue its efforts to bring non-affiliates into the CLC and at the same time create a climate suitable for organizing the unorganized; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this matter be given a high priority by the CLC."

I so move, seconded by J. Buchanan.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): A motion of concurrence in O-3 as amended. Are there anyone of you who wishes to speak?

MR. L. RUFO (ITU): I am in support of the Committee's recommendation. In fact, there is something that is being inspired by many trade unionists in the past. It is time that we can get all the unions in Canada under one umbrella so that we can fight on one front and not in different directions.

Therefore, I hope that the CLC Executive elected tomorrow will give high priority to insure that indeed we can bring those unions not affiliated with the House of Labour into the House of Labour, and will also encourage the organization of the unorganized and those members that are already organized, not to leave.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Hearing no further speakers, all those in favour of the motion of concurrence, as amended, raise their hand. Opposed. Motion carried and so ordered.

MR. J. BUCHANAN (Organization Committee Chairperson): Resolutions O-4, O-16 and O-22 deal with the same subject matter. While the resolutions in question fail to recognize the efforts put forward by the Canadian Labour Congress since the last Convention with respect to building coalitions of concerned citizens to fight for the right of Canadians, nevertheless the intent of the resolutions has merit.

Your Committee is therefore amending resolution O-4 to cover O-16 and O-22 and the amended resolution reads as follows:

"WHEREAS the labour movement has a responsibility and an interest in encouraging and supporting a powerful movement of the unemployed; and

"WHEREAS the 1984 Congress Convention called upon the Congress to work closely with federations of labour and labour councils to 'build effective grass roots coalitions of unions, the unemployed, churches, the women's movement among other groups, to fight for jobs and the rights of the unemployed'; and

"WHEREAS some progress has been made but a lot remains to be accomplished;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Congress continue its efforts and encourage federations and labour councils to increase their efforts in assisting the unemployed through the formation of provincial and regional coalitions; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC work closely with federations of labour and labour councils for the attainment of the aforementioned objectives."

Your Committee therefore recommends concurrence with resolutions O-4 as amended to cover as well resolutions O-16 and O-22; seconded by R. Bezo, Committee Secretary.

MR. W. MARLOWE (President, Alberta Building Trades Council): It is with great pleasure that I am once again able to stand in front of the delegates to this House of Labour in Canada.

I suppose some of the things I have to say to you might sound a bit emotional and one of the reasons for it, when we were so rudely pulled out of the House of Labour in Canada by our internationals, we had some 6,000 members in my local. Now these few short years later our local has around approximately 2,000 members with only about 180 of them working. Most of the ones have been unemployed for some three years now. Out of that, there came a need for the unemployed in our area to form together, because there was something lacking within the building trades. And that is where the whole grass roots level of this thing started.

There is an organization that is called "The Dandelions" and their slogan is "Dandelions never die." And I will tell you they are growing, not because of anything that we have done to help them as trade unionists, but out of necessity for the lack of what we have done to help them. And the movement is an honourable one and like their slogan says, they never die. I do not believe they will die, they will only grow stronger, but it is also something more than that. Anybody who has ever lived in an area where the dandelions grow, knows also that it is a flower of love because it is usually the first flower that the children given to their parents. So besides being strong and hardy, it also has the tranquility of the young people.

This organization needs help. They are trying right now to help fight an election in the Province of Alberta, to get rid of a Tory government that has made it impossible for trade unionists to live and work in that province.

It is a government that is also being condemned by the International Labour Organization for its union-busting tactics. My own local and the majority of the building trades people in the Province of Alberta have not had a collective agreement or any meaningful negotiation since the spring of 1984, and it does not look like we are about to get any unless we do get a change in government.

If ever there was an organization that looked after the unemployed, the Dandelions are it. Please, if any of you can afford to give anything to this organization to help these unemployed people, you can always do it through the federations of labour in the Provinces of Alberta and B.C. and wherever else the flowers start to bloom.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Thank you brother and welcome back.

MR. G. YETMAN (President, N.S. Fed. of Labour): This is one of the most important resolutions in my view to hit the floor at this Congress.

I know that free trade was important, technology and all the other things, but we have got a million and a half people unemployed in this country, Mr. Chairperson.

In my part of Canada, it is a disaster area. In Cape Breton Island, there are some 90 per cent of the people unemployed and what did "Muldune" do? "Muldune" came down and said he was going to do something about unemployment. He said it in Regina, he said it in the House of Commons and he said it in other places; and he has done nothing.

I just want to refer to why unemployment is the responsibility of the federal and the provincial governments in my part of Canada, Cape Breton Island. The federal government owns our coal mines, the provincial government owns our steel plant. You cannot blame private enterprise there, you have got to blame the governments. And they are doing nothing about it. The only way that we are going to do something is work with coalitions and with other people.

I wish to thank the delegates who brought some buttons so far from the Committee of Concern for the Unemployed. That is part of this program, and if we have to go back in every area of this country, in my view, and work with our friends wherever they are. Because we have always claimed in this movement and I

have always agreed, that we are our brothers' keeper. And those who may not be Christians, at least what you desire for yourself, you wish for all and that is a job and some of the good things, and that has not happened.

As I said, we thought that we had something. The Atlantic candidate told us that when the Macdonald Commission came down, the Big Mac Attack, that was our answer. And after he finished, we were wondering where the hell to beat this!

I remember he talked about the leap of faith. Well, I say to you free trade in my part of Canada would be a fatal leap because we also know what free trade has done with our fishermen. We know something about it, there is no job there. Our problem is economic, our solution is political. That's the only way we're going to get jobs. But we still have some Liberals and Tories down there and the ones that are there, they do not believe in public ownership.

From 1938 to 1958 Cape Bretoners did vote for the CCF, the predecessor of the NDP, and they took political action, but they waited for the rest of the country.

We are going to dump "Muldune" and we are going to get some public ownership and a government that believes in it and provides good jobs. And let us do it with our friends!

MR. K. CLAVETTE (Ottawa and District L.C.): Perhaps I could get a clarification point from the Committee.

What disturbs me in the substitute resolution is the dilution of unemployed action centres. Coming from Ottawa, where we have been trying to build a very positive strong action centre co-ordinating group through the Federation of Labour, and we have one in Ottawa that we have been trying to service the unemployed with, it concerns me that that is deleted. If you could give me a point of why that is, I would appreciate it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Is the Committee able to respond?

MR. J. BUCHANAN (Organization Committee Chairperson): It was our opinion at the time that the word "unemployed" would include the unemployed action centres.

MS. M. KERRY (CUPE): I rise to support this resolution and also to point out that so far, we have been neglecting one area of the unemployed and the unorganized. I am speaking of the post-high school unemployed and underemployed. I know that these young people all across the country are hunting for the "jobs, jobs, jobs;" promised by Mulroney. They are becoming increasingly discouraged and desperate. They are also becoming cynical not only of the governments in power but also for the labour movement in general. They buy the propaganda of the daily press that labour is jealous of the jobs they hold and they tend to see us as one of the enemy.

I can speak from personal experience. I have a 21-year old son who has been unemployed since he left high school Of his group of nine close buddies, only three are employed full-time; the rest are either underemployed or unemployed. Two have returned to school and face the following problems: the rising education costs; welfare rates that are too low; and training programs that raise hopes that are then dashed when no jobs are available.

I also know that it is really hard to get into an established work force. In my own local, the city of North Vancouver, the lowest age of outside workers in that work force is 55 years old. So it does not give much help or hope to our youth.

Depression and discouragement are leading youth to petty crime and drug abuse and a feeling of real hopelessness. What we, the labour movement, can do, is to get our youth involved in the political process, teach them the skills, give them the confidence to appear before government bodies and commissions and help them learn to lobby for jobs for youth.

I want to tell you too about what has been happening in the greater Vancouver area. The callous and dishonest Socred government in our province has ignored not only the pledge of our youth, but also of the rest of our unemployed and the disadvantaged.

Instead of bread, they offer us circuses. The circus of Expo 86 that was supposed to solve unemployment problems, instead has provided a minimal number of jobs at, or only slightly above, the minimum wage. Instead of providing the number of jobs needed to staff Expo, the directions have called for volunteers to staff the exhibits. There are 350 volunteers alone at the Ramses II exhibit there. The callous evictions by greedy landlords in the downtown area who want to take advantage of visitors to Expo are not censured by the provincial government or their lackeys, the Board of Directors of Expo. Food banks recently ceased to provide bags of groceries to the needy in the week that welfare checks are received; this is also due to lack of funds. Even our employed and organized workers are demoralized. What we face when we go to the bargaining table is a Socred-instituted act called the Compensation Stabilization Plan, which allows us at the very most 0 to 3 per cent increase in wages, from which any gains we make in benefits are taken, leaving us even more behind the rate of inflation. Eleven unemployment action centres in the Province of B.C. have been forced to close because of lack of funding. We should be supporting these centres financially and in any other way we can to organize the unemployed.

MR. J. McEWEN (Campbellton-Dalhousie and Dist. L.C.): I am not so much against this resolution as disappointed because this resolution certainly does not cover all the facets that it should cover.

It does say some very nice things, like "Congress shall continue in its efforts to encourage". I would like to know when the Congress made an honest effort to start to encourage.

I think that the move to assist and organize the unemployed has come from the bottom up. It has not come without clear-cut sanction, it has come often with the reluctance of the Congress because they do not see the full impact, like I do in the area I come from, of the unemployed, the impact on the community where we have over 50 per cent of our employable people either on welfare or unemployment insurance.

We certainly will not accept a resolution that is not addressing the real problems. We believe in our area that the Congress, the Federation of Labour and the Labour Council must get seriously involved, because this is certainly the priority problem of the 80s and if we do not address it properly, it will be our problem in the 90s.

Unemployed workers are organizing throughout Canada. In some areas, they are organizing with the help of labour councils and committed trade unionists. Those unemployed workers, organizations or unions, are certainly doing the right thing, where they have the clear direction of committed labour people. In other areas, I see the politicians taking them over and making them political animals. I see another area where the so-called extreme left, which are the ultra-left as far as I am concerned, are taking over these organizations in order to use them to their own ends.

At the same time, I see the Congress, the federations and the labour councils leaving a vacuum and if we are not prepared through stronger action to take control of the situation, these organizations will certainly rise up and take the jobs of the people we represent. I am also co-founder of an unemployed workers union, along with Brother Stanley Backingham and Brother L. McMillan.

The unemployed that we have organized certainly will not be allowed to fall into the hands of the politicians or those who professed to be of the ultra left. We are certainly going to do the job regardless of what kind of resolution the Congress passes.

I rise in disappointment, not condemnation, but disappointment, that the Congress has not seen fit to take all the resolutions including resolution no. 7 and meld them into a comprehensive policy that could be applied throughout this country. When the Campbellton-Dalhousie and District Labour Council sought help, I would like to go on record as thanking CUPE and Brother Jeff Rose, for releasing an individual to assist us. They are the only organization of the ones that responded that we asked; and for the record I would like to express appreciation to CUPE.

If we are not prepared to pass a better, stronger resolution and make sure that we have the input and the influence in these organizations, one day these will come back to haunt us.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Okay, the question is being called. All those in favour of putting the question raise their right hand. Opposed. The motion is carried. The question shall be put.

All those in favour of the motion of concurrence, raise their hand. Opposed. Motion carried and so ordered.

MR. J. BUCHANAN (Organization Committee Chairperson): We would like to deal with the Executive Council's Emergency Resolution No. 2.

MR. R. BEZO (Organization Committee Secretary): Emergency Resolution No. 2, submitted to the Organization Committee by the Executive.

"WHEREAS security guards who are members of the Steelworkers Union have been on strike since February 26, 1986; and

"WHEREAS their employer, Burns Agency, had a contract with Air Canada; and

"WHEREAS Air Canada, in order to bust the union agreed that Burns Agency cancel their contract, an then signed a contract with Agence Métropole which has announced its intention of hiring scabs at the Dorval and Mirabel airports in Quebec;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress bring all necessary pressure to bear on Air Canada and Labour Minister McKnight and demand that the right to unionization and collective negotiation be recognized for security guards at Dorval and Mirabel; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all CLC affiliates also exert pressure on Air Canada in order that this Crown corporation put an end to its anti-union attitude and its discrimination;

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC lobby the government of Canada, particularly the Minister of Transport, to take over the responsibility of security and the screening of passengers at Canadian airports, withdrawing this responsibility from airlines."

MR. J. BUCHANAN (Organization Committee Chairperson): The Committee moves concurrence seconded by R. Bezo.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): A motion of concurrence on Emergency Resolution No. 2.

MR. G. DOCQUIER (National Director, Steelworkers): I want to thank the Organization Committee for accepting this as an emergency resolution.

I think we are really dealing with an emergency. I think that what is happening in Dorval and Mirabel is a demonstration of the determination of the Conservative government to oppose unionization of people that are working under federal jurisdiction, to undermine the labour movement in its action.

It is the first time, if I remember correctly, in twelve years that we have scabbing in Quebec. I think that, for the federal government through a Crown corporation to use scabs in a province where scabbing has been banned, is a tragedy for us and it is a set-back.

I think we have to be very united on this issue. What is happening in Dorval and Mirabel will happen elsewhere. It is also a show of determination of the government to maintain a wage at a level where people cannot make a living out of it. Can you live on $4.00 an hour? Can you live on $4.25 an hour? This is exactly what they have done.

Not only do they impose on their sub-contractors, but they are going against the decree that we have been able to bargain for the security guards in Quebec. We do represent 10,000 security guards in Quebec, and they are covered by a decree now that provides them with $6.20 an hour. This is no big deal but it is much better than $4.25. That federal government is not only going against the legislation of the province, disregarding the political decision of the Quebec government, but is disregarding also another regulation that provides for a better situation financially than the one they want to impose, not only on the security guards but also on the people that are refueling the planes in Dorval and Mirabel and elsewhere in Canada.

I urge this Convention to support our people. We are not asking for a ban of Air Canada. But I want to mention that labour unions who fly very often should not use Air Canada. We should tell them by our own resolution, by our own determination, that when they hurt small people that are deprived of the right to have a union, we can retaliate. Not only are they now moving from one contractor to another, but they have denied our people the right to belong to a union. They have not offered them new jobs. So this is one additional example of the determination of our Conservative government to level the standards of living of our people not level up, but level down. Please help us fight it.

MR. N. LOCKHART (CALFAA): I rise in favour of this motion. This ties in with the occupational health and safety concerns that we as flight attendants have. The security guards are one line of defence against terrorism and they are vital in the protection of passengers and workers in our Canadian airports; this line of defence should not be contracted-out to the lowest bidder using non-union scabs. Instead the answer, we feel, is that the government not the airlines, should be responsible for airport security.

The airlines, whose main concerns are for their schedules and not upsetting their passengers, have proven time and again that safety and security should not be allowed to upset the airport routine. As well, the airlines talk a great deal about security but they are not prepared to pay the big dollars that should be invested in upgrading our airport security.

As for the guards themselves, their wages and working conditions are frankly atrocious. Once again, the airlines are more concerned with contracting to a low bidder than they are with improving security. And who is the lowest bidder? Security companies that are non-union, or security firms such as Burns who are intent upon keeping their contract by keeping their workers' wages and working conditions in the mold of a MacDonald's.

It is a bloody disgrace frankly when the Burns' employees gain some experience in their profession, the lousy wages and working conditions end up causing them to leave. Who is going to stick around? They end up looking for better work. How are we ever going to get experienced professional security personnel at our airports if we allow such a disgraceful situation to exist?

We will only improve the quality of our security personnel by getting them a decent standard of living. Let us support them in their fight to get a decent contract for their members at Burns. By doing so, we will not only be helping our own but we will also help ourselves by ensuring that experienced personnel are looking after our security at Canadian airports.

MS. C. MICKLEWRIGHT (President, Vancouver Joint Council of Airport Unions): In my own experience in dealing with Vancouver airport that the situation has happened time and time again, that the direction has come from Transport Canada that security guards are not important. Every time a group of employees working for a security company is organized, as soon as the contract with that employer expires, Transport Canada does not renew the contract, turns around and goes again to the lowest bidder, non-union.

This is happening at a critical time with security at airports in this country, when we are facing potential terrorist threats, when the airlines that are operating flights to the United States have absolutely no security clearance, there is no X-ray protection there. Employees are being hired by the security companies at low rates with or without organization; they are not given the training that is necessary.

Transport Canada is not taking on the responsibility that it should be taking on to provide the proper security and protection for all workers at airports and for all passengers that have to travel on airlines in this country. It is a particular concern right now because I understand that the Burns security contract to Vancouver airport has just been cancelled.

They have just recently been unionized, they have only been around two years and now, here we go again. I am not sure that Air Canada is the only culprit in this. It is my understanding that the contracts at the airport are paid for and supported by all the airlines and most of the airlines have committees at the airport that made decisions about these things. So do not let us just hold Air Canada responsible for this; all the other airlines have a say in it. With Expo 86 coming up in Vancouver, terrorist activities are a problem. Airports like Dorval and Montreal as access airports in and out of this country pose a very serious threat to all of us.

MR. H. DILLON (NUPGE-AUPE): I rise in support of this resolution very strongly. I believe that this section of workers is highly exploited and this section of the workers has been long neglected by CLC.

I had the chance to work as a security guard for $3.25 for a year and a half, raising three kids, and I had to take another job of $4.00. I know what it is to be a security guard.

Here in this particular instance, a firm like Air Canada which is a publicly-owned firm, seems to be in clear complicity with contractors who employ the security guards. I think it is our duty to come to the rescue, to help this very exploited section of the workers and set an example showing to Air Canada that CLC is behind these security guards.

We will not neglect our brothers and sisters in its very neglected industry.

MR. P. STIER (CALFAA): Mr. Chairperson, I move for referral of this emergency resolution with specific instructions to add another resolve.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Brother, you are at the pro mike, you are not at the con mike.

Any further comments? The question is being called. Okay.

MR. P. STIER (CALFAA): Thanks. The specific instruction is to add another resolved that "the CLC lobby the government of Canada, particularly the Minister of Transport to take over the responsibility of screening of passengers at Canadian airports, withdrawing this responsibility from airline employers."

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): A motion of referral with some instructions. Is there a seconder? Seconder, non-debatable. All those in favour of the motion of referral, raise their hands. Opposed. Motion carried and so ordered.

MR. R. CASHIN (Organization Committee Member): The next resolution is O-6 and deals with the support by the Canadian Labour Congress for union label action.

The Committee recommends concurrence in resolution O-6 with one amendment in the third line of "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED", to change the word "expand" to "continue" and it shall read:

"WHEREAS the hard-won security and standard of living established by unions is being threatened by anti-union manufacturers and by the importation of cheap goods from low-wage earning countries; and

"WHEREAS the union label is a guarantee of quality, skilled craftsmanship and improved working conditions;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Convention urge all affiliated unions to redouble their union label activities and call upon the Canadian Labour Congress to continue their efforts on behalf of the union label program in order to protect our hard won working conditions and jobs."

I so move; seconded by J. Buchanan.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Is there any debate? Hearing none, all those in favour of the motion, raise their hand. Opposed. Motion carried and so ordered.

It seems to me we have reached the hour, the bewitching hour. The delegates have been superb tonight, it has been a real good session.

Thank you very much and I declare adjournment.

The Convention adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1986
Morning Session

Secretary-Treasurer Shirley Carr called the Convention to order at 9:37 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I am going to call the Credentials Committee in for their fourth report.

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

MR. I. REILLY (Credentials Committee Chairperson): First, I would like to thank the Canadian Labour Congress representatives and especially the office staff who are assisting the Committee in working very late hours to make sure we are prepared for all the votes. I would also like to thank all the members of the Committee who have helped us; and the report is as follows:

Fraternal delegates	3
ICFTU representative	1
Congress Officers	4
Representatives of affiliated organizations	98
Officers and delegates from Federations of Labour and Labour Councils	108
Representatives from affiliated organizations	2.655
Representatives of directly chartered unions	8
TOTAL	2.877

Moved by myself and seconded by L. Nicholson.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): You have heard the report of the Credentials Committee that is being moved and seconded in its adoption. All those in favour of the Credentials Committee's fourth report, please show. Motion carried.

I have a speaker on mike six. Do you have a point, brother?

MR. P. WRIGHT (PSAC-UPSCE): Madam Chairperson, I wish to speak on a question of personal privilege. I received this morning a beautiful Convention poster but I could not get one in French. I would like to know if French posters are available and, if not, why not?

MR. R. MERCIER (Executive Vice-President, CLC): These posters are available in both languages if you need some, ask our distribution desk, they will give you some.

MR. J. GOODISON (IAM): Yesterday, somebody raised an issue about not using the Shaeffer pens that are in the kit.

The members of Machinists' Union work for Shaeffer pens and are good trade unionists, people that have fought for and kept the trade union and union shop and who have to fight continually with this company.

Now, it may be that they are not manufactured in Canada. The pens are made by trade unionists in the United States and they are assembled here and they are the only pens that are assembled in Canada. Now unless some have found a way they can write with their fingers, they better buy Shaeffer pens and keep those 60 office and shop women employed.

MAY DAY CENTENARY

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): This is the fourth day of our Convention, a very significant day, May 1. We are recognizing two very important centenaries. If you look in the kit you will find that you have a leaflet recognizing the progress over 100 years by the workers, May 1, 1886 to May 1, 1986.

Those interested in and knowledgeable about the labour movement's history, and I hope that includes all of you, will be familiar with the events which unfolded 100 years today in Chicago. The leaflet that has been distributed describes them in some detail. On May 1, 1886, organized labour pioneers were struggling for a shorter working day, an essential objective then as now. This day of action was particularly well supported by working men and women in the city of Chicago, spreading over following days and culminated in the Hay Market Square incident, on the evening of May 4. As a result of trumped-up charges, four union activists paid the ultimate sacrifice for their devotion to the improvement of working and living conditions through a strong trade union movement. Today, we remember them with pride for their courageous yet tragic contribution to our collective growth and strength.

It was also in 1886 that the Montreal Labour Council was founded. In the 100 years since its founding, this Council has effectively represented concerns of working people in the great city of Montreal. We wish the Council well in continuing its efforts into its second century of operation.

The kind of dedication and determination that sparked the May 1, 1886, protest and built an active labour council in Montreal should serve as a beacon and as an example for all of us in 1986.

The challenges we face, and there are many, will demand the same will, the same conviction that marks the honourable past to which we pay tribute today. As we gain purpose and strength from so many that have preceded us and shown the way, I can think of nothing more fitting than the word of August Spies, one of the four Chicago martyrs:

"If you think by hanging us you can stamp out the labour movement . . . the movement from which the downtrodden millions, the millions who toil in want and misery, expect salvation — if this is your opinion, then hang us! Here you will tread upon a spark, but there and there, behind you and in front of you, and everywhere flames blaze up. It is a subterranean fire. You cannot put it out".

That is what they said and that is why we honour them, and I thank you for your attention for this May Day intervention.

I now call on Brother White to let you know what the orders of today are.

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW, Canada): Today, we will have the election of Officers, of the Executive Committee and Executive Council. Following that, instead of the Report of the Committee on Government Employees, we are going to try and bring the Health and Safety Committee back to the platform to deal with at least one of the resolutions and then we will move on to the Report of the Committee on Government Employees, the Report of the Committee on General Resolutions; in the afternoon the Report of the Committee on Education, followed by the Report of the Transportation and Maritime Committee, the Report of the Committee on Energy Policies, the Report of the Union Label Trades and Services Department which will be a video report, it will not be a written document. We hope to follow that agenda for the balance of the day.

MS. D. WIGMORE (NUPGE-MGEA): A point of personal privilege. On the first day of this Convention, people who smoked were asked to keep it down.

If we are all going to be in here and have to be here for the voting, I would ask that the delegates who smoke please not do so during that time because I cannot get up and leave the area where I am. I am getting sick from the stuff, and so are other people.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Because we are going into the elections, I would hope that you would have some consideration for those that are having problems with the smoke.

MR. J. GUILD (Halifax-Dartmouth District L.C.): On the paper listing the 15 nominations for vice-president at large, the instructions in brackets on the first line . . . It says vote for fourteen, of whom six are women. I understood there are seven women, it is perfectly all right to vote for all seven women.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, the elections will be explained. We are now going to go into the elections. I would ask you to assist us in every way possible because this is the largest Convention we have ever had. I would ask that you pull your chairs in as close as you can to the tables so that they can get around and through, and up and down the aisles.

I would now call on Brother Louis Laberge who will conduct the elections on behalf of the Convention.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

MR. L. LABERGE (Elections Committee Chairperson): Thank you, Madam Chairperson, and I hope all the delegates have a very, very good May First.

You have in your kits the list of the scrutineers who will be helping us during the the entire election as well as the procedure for the election. Is Brother Johnston in front? We are calling all the scrutineers to come up front please.

All right, may I ask the Committee to start distributing the ballots.

As you know, all nominations are in; they were returned on forms provided by the Canadian Labour Congress. I will still have to call for nominations just the same. These are the rules of procedure.

MR. E. JOHNSTON (Ballotting Committee Co-ordinator): If the balloting committee that is up front would now take their places so that they can pick up their ballots as well.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): Nominations are now open for the position of President of this Canadian Labour Congress. We have received one paper for nomination and it is for Shirley Carr, from the Canadian Union of Public Employees.

Are there any further nominations, once? Any other nomination, twice? Any other nomination three times? Nominations are closed.

(Standing ovation)

Administration of oath of office to President-elect Shirley Carr by Election Chairperson Louis Laberge.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): Now it is my pleasure to congratulate you as the new President of this Canadian Labour Congress.

MS. S. CARR (President, CLC): Before I give you a few words, I would like to introduce to you some of my family, and you know that I have always kept my family out of the limelight for a lot of reasons. But I would like to bring up here, just so that you can say "hello," five very special people who came here from Niagara Falls; one is my mother, one is my husband, one is my very dear sister Grace, one is a very dear friend Dorothy and a special dear friend, Dr. Tom Jamieson. I would like them to come up here to see you.

I want you to know that this lady is the reason for it all, she is eighty-six years old tomorrow. And I know that you all wish her a Happy Birthday. This is my husband, Bruce, whom it seems I have been married to forever. He used to tell the story that he married me young so that he could bring me up his way, and I told him that the first 25 years were his, the second 25 were mine and I am on my 25.

I want to say a very special thanks first of all to my union. You know when you start out with a union, it is always something that stays in your heart and certainly in your soul and I have watched my union grow with strength and pride. I have watched presidents whom I worked with, Stan Little and now Jeff Rose. One always has a distinct loyalty to your own organization but this distinct loyalty and commitment is now pledged to this Congress and has been since I was elected in 1974.

It is an honour to be elected to the highest position in the labour movement. It is really the greatest honour that could befall any trade unionist, because we represent you and I shall have to represent you along with my colleagues no matter where I go.

I dedicate myself to work entirely for the workers' rights and for the betterment of all working men and women everywhere, whether they be in Canada or anywhere around the world.

I also dedicate myself to the disadvantaged and the underprivileged in this country that we are working so hard to help. I will immediately, brothers and sisters, upon my return to Ottawa, begin to plan a process of consultation and the leaders of the affiliates and the Executive Council and the Executive Committee of the Congress to establish the agenda and to carry out the mandate of this Convention. I shall also tell you that if there are internal changes, if they are necessary to carry out this mandate, to meet the objectives of this Congress, then these also will be forthcoming. It is time for a change, it is time for unity and it is time for peace within the labour movement.

One thing is certain, however. At no time, can we lose sight of our commitment to the New Democratic Party in this process.

Another thing is certain, and that is the message that I intend on your behalf to bear to the Prime Minister of this country, if he lets me in and wants to see me. We know how to do things like that, we have sat on doors before, on floors before, outside of doors. We want to see him and talk to him. This Council and Committee will be telling him that we want to talk about his economic agenda and his position on free trade. We want to ask him what his plans are for jobs for the unemployed and continued jobs for the Canadian workforce in this country. We want to talk to him about his plans for deregulation of our country an the loss of jobs, and we want to talk about his plans for privatization of our public institutions. How dare he put into jeopardy, our institutions for our people! We are going to remind him, in case somebody has not told him already, that the Cabinet of this Canadian labour movement is just as important to the people of this country as the Cabinet he claims is making the decisions within his House.

And I want to tell him, on your behalf, that the Cabinet of the labour movement wants to discuss with him all issues and to remind him that we have an economic agenda also and we are going to be heard. And the most important point we are going to make is, this is our Canada, and it is not for sale.

My dear friends, I want to assure you that the headquarters in Ottawa is open for all of you, if you have problems, if you have criticism too. We are there to build this labour movement in Canada stronger than it has ever been, with numbers larger than we have ever had. They can challenge us, they can try to wipe the floor with us, they can kill people on the jobs. They can do all these things. But they no longer are going to get away with it. We are going to be standing up and we are going to stand tall and we are going to be accounted for. That is a commitment and we are going to carry out with your help, the help of the Council, the help of the Committee, the help of the four officers, and the unity across this country. Thank you, thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): Nominations are now open to the position of Secretary-Treasurer of the Canadian Labour Congress.

We have received one nomination: Richard Mercier, Québec Federation of Labour.

Any other nominations. Twice. Any other nominations? Three times. Nominations are closed.

Swearing in of Richard Mercier as Secretary-Treasurer of the CLC by Elections Chairperson Louis Laberge.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): I congratulate you.

MR. R. MERCIER (Secretary-Treasurer, CLC): Thank you very much. You will easily understand that I wish to say a few words, after confirmation by all of you this morning, of the Executive Council's decision to place their confidence in me as Secretary-Treasurer. First of all, I wish to thank my president, Louis Laberge, for nominating me. I wish to thank the QFL and my union, the UFCW, for their support. You can count on my indestructible fidelity.

I also want to assure you, dear Sister President, of my most loyal support; to my fellow officers and members of the Executive Council, I guarantee my commitment and my co-operation in the true spirit of team-work. Finally, I want to assure all of our affiliates of my sincerest dedication to serving them and our cause.

At this Convention, challenges have been clearly defined, programs of action well mapped out, and we shall continue together to roll up our sleeves for the well-being of the entire population.

We reach out to them, we need them, women and men, the youth, the senior citizens, the coloured people, the unemployed, the disabled, the immigrants and the native people, to take up all those important challenges. Please answer our call. To all the delegates, again, from the bottom of my heart, thank you very much for your confidence.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): Nominations are now open for two Executive Vice-Presidents.

We have received two nominations: Dick Martin, United Steelworkers of America; and Nancy Riche, National Union of Provincial Government Employees.

Are there any further nominations? Once. Any other nominations? Twice. Any other nominations? Three times. Nominations are closed.

Swearing in of Nancy Riche and Dick Martin as Executive Vice-Presidents of the CLC.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): You are now elected. I congratulate you.

MR. D. MARTIN (Executive Vice-President, CLC): It has been a great pleasure to have served you as Executive Vice-President for the past two years. I look forward to the next two years. It is a challenge, a privilege and an honour and it is not something that I take lightly.

It is especially a challenge in view of what we have passed here in the last few days, which lays out an agenda that is

extremely ambitious; but it is one that I know we will accomplish in unity with the team and march into the next century as a strong united and committed labour movement. I dedicate myself to those aims working with the Executive Committee, the President and the Executive Council. It is unity that will take us into the future, strong and united.

MS. N. RICHE (Executive Vice-President, CLC): When we talk about democracy, it is nice to know that I was elected from the floor. Thank you, I am the first Newfoundlander ever to stand here in this position.

While I do not have tremendous bias towards Newfoundland, I thought I should just mention it to you, I cannot stand here with a record on the Executive Council, Executive Committee of this Convention, but my record in the labour movement, for those who know me, I am sure stands me in good stead, both in my province and the National Union of Provincial Government Employees.

My experience with the Federation of Labour in my home province certainly shows to people that my involvement has not been restricted to the public sector. I started to learn that the people in the public sector had to know what was happening in the private sector. While we represent both sectors, I think we represent the working people of this country, the unionized and the unorganized. I also have a special bias for women. We let them know in the corporate sector, in the government offices, that we are the ones leading the way on the issue of equality, and we are the ones who are going to win on the issues of equality. For those people I worked with in the New Democratic Party in Newfoundland, sometimes we are very lonely, but we do have a member in the House of Assembly, and I guarantee you, we will have more in the next election. You know my commitment to the party, i pledge to you my energy because I know how to work very hard and I, along with the other Officers, the Executive Committee, the Executive Council, will devote myself to you. Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): Nominations are now open for eight general vice-presidents, we have received nine nominations.

Bean, Daryl	(Public Service Alliance of Canada)
Docquier, Gérard	(United Steelworkers of America)
Fryer, John	(National Union of Provincial Government Employees)
Hunter, Jim	(Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers)
Munro, Jack	(International Woodworkers of America)
Parrot, Jean-Claude	(Canadian Union of Postal Workers)
Plamondon, Huguette	(United Food and Commercial Workers)
Rose, Jeff	(Canadian Union of Public Employees)
White, Bob	(United Automobile Workers)

I will ask the nine candidates to please step up front and I want to remind the delegates that they absolutely have to vote for eight. Are there any further nominations? Once. Any other nominations? Twice. Any other nominations? Three times. Nominations are closed.

Swearing in of candidates for the position of General Vice-President.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): Now, delegates, this is perhaps a bit tricky but we have to vote by numbers. Daryl Bean, number one; Gérard Docquier, number two; John Fryer, number three; Jim Hunter, number four; Jack Munro, number five; Jean-Claude Parrot, number six; Huguette Plamondon, number seven; Jeff Rose, number eight; and Bob White, number nine.

MR. BEAUDRY (PSAC): There is one remark that you have made twice in French and not in English, that they must for eight and if they do not vote for eight, a total of eight, the ballot will be spoiled.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): Thank you. Now I will not have to repeat it. Now, has every delegate received his ballot?

MR. D. SANGSTER (NUPGE-OPSEU): Some of us have not got the books yet, is it possible to get one now?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): We will remember, at the last Convention, I believe, there were perhaps six or seven delegates who said they had lost their ballots. When we decided that perhaps if they were to come up front, we might be able to give them a second ballot, there were about 50 people rushing up in front. We cancelled our decision and those are the rules.

While the scrutineers will be counting the votes, we will go to the Report of Government Employees Committee, because we have to wait until the results are in before we call for nominations for the next election.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr, President, CLC): I would ask the Committee of the Government Employees please to come to the podium.

I would like to bring forward somebody to say hello, a brother that many of you will remember and many of you know. He has been a member of Local 443 of the Bakery and Confectionary Workers, Saint John, New Brunswick for 38 years. He was also founding President of the New Brunswick New Democratic Party and he was also at the founding Convention of the CLC in 1956. Brother John Simonds also was a staff member of the Canadian Labour Congress for a long time before he went to the Workers' Relations Branch of the International Labour Organization. This brother gave us tremendous assistance at the ILO dealing with the Committee of Freedom of Association and those cases that we presented to them.

ADDRESS BY JOHN SIMONDS
Workers' Relations Branch, International Labour Organization

MR. J. SIMONDS (ILO): Personnel comment: I think I speak on behalf of all of us who have worked with you, all your colleagues from Latin America, from Asia, particularly my colleagues in Africa, certainly the staff of the International Labour Office and all of those who work for the various international trade secretariats in Geneva, when I say that your election as President and Chief Executive Officer of the Canadian Labour Congress this morning has given us something special to celebrate this May Day.

It is indeed a great honour and personal pleasure to represent our Director-General, Francis Blanchard, at this 16th Convention of the Canadian Labour Congress. He has asked me to extend to all of you his warm regards and best wishes for success.

He would have welcomed, as I do, this opportunity to express our appreciation for our support for and your commitment to the efforts of the ILO to secure for workers everywhere a better life based on peace, social justice and equality.

Canada, as a founding member of the ILO, has, since 1919, contributed greatly to our work and we owe this country a particular debt of gratitude for having provided a home for us during those dark days of the Second World War.

Over these past 67 years, Canadian workers have played a significant role in our activities. There are many in this hall who have given freely of their time and their talents to our various meetings of experts and of the ten industrial committees on which

Canada is represented, as well as those who have contributed so effectively to the success of our annual International Labour Conference.

As in any organization like the ILO, there are those who have made an outstanding contribution of their work over the past 25 years. I have had the privilege of working with many of them in one capacity or another.

I recall particularly the late and much loved first president of the Canadian Labour Congress, Claude Jodoin; Kalmen Kaplansky, who was honoured not so long ago for his lifelong commitment to human rights; my good friend Joe Morris, who was the longest serving vice-chairperson of the workers' group of our Governing Body and the first worker to become its chairperson; your new President, Shirley Carr, who, as workers' chairperson of our Governing Body Committee on Discrimination and of our Conference Committee on Apartheid, provided inspired leadership in our efforts in our fight for equality of treatment for workers throughout the world, especially in our effort to put an end to the notorious system of apartheid in South Africa; and latterly, your new Secretary-Treasurer Richard Mercier, who as chairperson of the workers' group, played such an essential role in ensuring the success of our Regional Conference for the Americas which recently took place in Montreal.

I would not wish, however, to create the impression that in the ILO, we recognize and appreciate only those activities carried out by the CLC at the international level which are directly related to our programs. We realize that the success of our work depends to a great extent on the existence of strong, effective free and independent workers' organizations and your efforts to create such organizations are indeed worthy of special mention.

Your contribution to the work of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and, in particular, its education program, is an outstanding example of commitment to international solidarity.

These efforts have been greatly enhanced by your own activities, generated by the CLC project planners who have accepted the challenge to work in developing countries to improve the capacity of trade unions to pursue social and economic justice for their members.

I also wish to recall the tremendous contribution you have made to the Commonwealth Trade Union Council. This organization, which I might remind you, was conceived by the Canadian Labour Congress, has, under the chairpersonship of your retiring president, Dennis McDermott, made an enormous contribution to the development of trade unions in those countries which share with Canada membership in the Commonwealth family of nations.

There is one particular project which, for obvious reasons, I would like to single out for special attention and that is the joint ILO/CLC/CIDA project for workers' education for Black workers' organizations in South Africa and Namibia. Through this project, we have provided special leadership training designed to assist in the development of strong, effective workers' organizations which will play such a crucial role in this part of the world in the years to come.

The work being done by both our organizations to promote and strengthen trade unions is particularly essential at this time. It is precisely now that workers and their organizations are facing the greatest challenge in recent history.

Undoubtedly the question of employment lies at the very heart of the problem. Our studies have convinced us that there is a need to create at least 600 million new jobs between now and the year 2000. We recognize the seriousness of this problem in the industrialized countries; but we are also aware of the more disastrous situation in the Third World, where, in many cases, only one in ten school-leavers is likely to find employment. When we add to this the effects of changing trade patterns and new technology, the prospects are indeed bleak. One cannot help but ask if a country like Canada, which is so rich in resources, cannot solve its unemployment problems, what hope can there be for the poorer developing countries?

As I come into contact with workers in different parts of the world, with different economic and political systems, I hear many simplistic answers to this complex problem. Perhaps we, in the ILO, from our global perspective, can see the wider picture; and of one thing I am convinced. There is no simple answer. We will not solve the problems of disparity of income between the North and South by creating jobs in the South at the expense of unemployment in the North; nor can we solve the question of youth unemployment by putting aside those older productive workers who have contributed so much to society in order to make room for the young. We will not solve the debt crisis in developing countries by destroying financial institutions in the lending countries, nor will we succeed in coping with the challenges of the new technology by ignoring the plight of those workers who will become redundant.

We, in the ILO, have no magic formula to resolve these problems. But we are certain that no solution will be found in the absence of a strong political will to do so. Furthermore, no just and equitable solution can be forthcoming without the full and equal participation of workers and their organizations.

But how is this to be achieved when in many countries those very organizations so essential for the promotion of social justice are themselves under attack? We know this from the ever increasing number of complaints lodged with our Committee on Freedom of Association. These complaints run from interference with free collective bargaining, a situation not entirely unknown to many in this hall, to interference with the right to organize, aided often by what you have come to call union-busting firms, to the complete dissolution of unions and, in many cases, even more serious complaints about incarceration, disappearance and even murder of trade unionists.

There are, of course, the much more subtle attempts to weaken the movement. I am sure that you have all read, as I have, the many articles appearing in the press in various countries including here in Canada, which proclaim the diminishing influence of trade unions in the present situation. Many of them, I am sure, are written with great delight; and read with even greater enthusiasm by those who would like to see your organization disappear as the searing social conscience of this country or, at the very least, its influence reduced to a whimpering voice in the wilderness.

Many of these articles call on the readers to consider the problems of "The Role of Trade Unions in Crisis". May I suggest that the authors of such articles are not only deluding themselves, but their readers as well. I do not pretend for a moment that unions have not experienced hardship during those difficult times, but I would suggest that it would be more accurate and more productive to direct attention in a slightly different and I believe more appropriate theme: "The Role of Trade Unions Within a Society in Crisis". Would anyone deny that when the factories close, the shareholders and in particular, the entire community, are also seriously affected?

It is not society as a whole that suffers from the burden of vast numbers of its citizens being unemployed and drawing from rather than contributing to the wealth of the country?

The critics play an interesting game with figures when they equate a drop in membership with the corresponding diminution of influence. Whether the CLC has 2.5 million members, 2 million members or 1.8 million members, is not the point. The point is that this organization is, was, and will continue to be the strong, responsible and vocal champion of the non-rich in Canadian society. That cannot be changed or chastised by wishful thinking.

To those who seek to weaken or destroy free and independent workers' organizations, I can only say that they do so at their peril for, if they succeed, they will surely replace a responsible democratic institution dedicated to the pursuit of social justice through dialogue by the chaos of mob reaction, where you may be certain that the voice of the people will not be silenced.

Despite our wide range of activities in the field of employment, training, occupational safety and health, vocational training and rehabilitation, education and technical co-operation, just to mention a few, the focal point of ILO's preoccupation shall remain the protection of the right of workers to join free and independent organizations of their choice, free from interference and domination from any source, as well as the promotion of these workers' organizations as equal partners in society. And to that end, we look forward to your continued support.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We are now going to deal with Document no. 6, the Report of the Government Employees' Committee.

MR. B. HORNUNG (NUPGE/AUPE): I understand that Brother McDermott had received a letter earlier in the week that had not been brought to the attention of the Executive Council, but that this letter was given to the Executive Council this morning. The letter is from the Kids' Union of Canada, which is based in Calgary at the present time, I believe that this letter has a message that is very important for the delegates and I would appreciate if you would read the letter to the delegates, if you have it with you.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, I have not received it as yet; but I will do it this afternoon.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' COMMITTEE

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I now call the Chairperson of the Committee dealing with Government Employees.

MR. D. BEAN (Government Employees' Committee Chairperson): We will deal with Resolution GE-3 first. I should bring to the attention of the delegates that GE-3 was also submitted by OPSEU, although it is not listed accordingly in the book. GE-3 covers resolutions GE-2, GE-11, GE-16 and GE-18. The resolution is amended as follows:

> "WHEREAS political freedom is the cornerstone of a democratic society; and
>
> "WHEREAS certain public employees are denied the right to actively participate in the political process which means that they do not have the same political rights as other members of society; and
>
> WHEREAS the rights of many public employees are severely constrained in the matter of free speech;
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress, working with federations of labour, demand that governments revoke the discriminatory legislation, regulations and administrative procedures which restrict federal, provincial and municipal employees from speaking out on public issues and participating fully in political activities".

On behalf of the Committee, I so move, seconded by Brother Findlay.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Committee's recommendation is concurrence in GE-3, delegate at mike six?

MR. J. CLANCY (NUPGE-OPSEU): I am president of the Ontario Public Service Employees' Union. This is an issue that is of importance to all public sector workers across this country; indeed to workers regardless of whether they are public or private sector.

This is an issue that determines whether we have the right to speak publicly about our work; and our work is in hospitals, on the roads, in the jails, in the schools. Our work, in many ways, determines the quality of life that we enjoy in the provinces and our country. We do not have the right, we do not have the freedom, to speak publicly nor to participate fully in the political events in the municipalities, in the provinces nor the federal government. I encourage delegates to vote for this; and indeed encourage the Congress, when they speak to the Prime Minister, to place this high in the agenda and I ask the Congress to remind Mr. Mulroney and other government leaders that it is 1986 and not 1906.

MR. L. GERARD (Steelworkers): We talked about our agenda for the last couple of days, we talked about campaigning against free trade, we talked about supporting the New Democratic Party, I think it is a terrible sin of omission when the largest employers in the province, the largest employers in the country, deny their employees the right to speak out. I cannot imagine a private sector person working for his employer, not having the right to speak out on what he thought was wrong with that employer.

If those rights are good enough for private sector workers, they should be good enough for public sector workers. I am proud to say that the theme of this Convention is unity. If we are really going to talk about unity, it is time that the private sector workers recognize that we cannot accomplish our goals, we cannot accomplish the kind of dreams that we have unless we manage to get for the public sector workers the same rights that we enjoy. They are prohibited from participating in the democratic process of this country simply because of who their employer is. They are prohibited from speaking out against their employer and if those were the things that we have to put up with at Stelco and Inco and Algoma Steel and any of these places, that employer would trample us into the ground.

MS. P. LEE (NUPGE-OPSEU): I can only urge all of you to endorse this resolution. It is a wonderful resolution and it does a lot to free the servants. We have to serve in silence because we cannot speak out on any issue unless we risk losing our jobs, so please vote this in unanimously.

MR. R. EDDINGTON (NUPGE-OPSEU): I too would urge the delegates to support this resolution. One of the papers this morning or yesterday reported about an assistant deputy-minister speaking out in public on terrorism and having been suspended with pay. There are two points here. If I was suspended, it would be without pay and the act that we come under in Ontario says that you must not speak out on a public issue.

I wonder what that says about the platform of our governments. One of our members in OPSEU a few years ago was elected president of the NDP riding association, he was summarily fired, re-hired through the grievance procedure, but, to this day, anyone in that position is still being hassled in the workplace. Two years ago, I was elected president of my NDP riding association and once that hit the local papers, my deputy-minister got involved with hassling me in the workplace. We must continue the fight to protect all workers' rights and that includes my right, as an individual in this country, to speak out on whatever issue I wish to and not have to worry about my job for having done it.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Energy Policy Committee has asked to meet at 11:00 o'clock this morning, which is about six or eight minutes from now, behind the stage. Committee members are R. Basken, Jack MacDonald, Len Stevens, Pat Wocknitz, Bill Stuart and Jim Gill.

MR. P. UPSHAW (NUPGE-OPSEU): Once I had the opportunity to work for UAW in Oshawa; and at that time I had the opportunity of working for the NDP. I was a "bag man", campaign man, organizer. Then I moved into the government and all of a sudden I could not do any of these things any more. I could

not even put a sign on my lawn. I could not speak up about what I felt about the issues, especially if it had anything to do with the area where I worked. Now I personally have no liking to go to the southern states because I know how they would treat me down there, but I sure would like to be treated equally here in my country. Sometimes I get kind of used to being treated as a minority but now my brothers and sisters right across this province are being treated the same way. So I think it is time that we take the message to our employer and let them know that this country is free and democratic and has to be kept that way.

MR. G. BLANCHARD (NUPGE-NSGEU): We are talking about rights that some of us in this hall do not have. And I urge every delegate to support this resolution. There is a rumour that Marcos is in Halifax. His name is Buchanan. Government employees, the employees of Mr. Buchanan, do not have the right to speak out, they do not have the right to negotiate and, as a matter of fact, they are taking away the right to strike from our correctional officers in the province right at this moment. When I get back to Halifax next week, there is a bill hitting the floor of the legislature that will take away from 400 correctional officers in the province of Nova Scotia the right to strike. You take away our right to strike, you take away the right to bargain. What they will do is give us binding arbitration, collective begging. We have taken the political rights into the court system. That is a long fight. We are going to educate our members and I am hoping that, somewhere in the future, the members of NSGEU can do what they did in NAPE and if they do not give us the rights, we will take the rights and we need your support.

MR. R. MARTIN (NUPGE-OPSEU): This resolution speaks to a number of things and one of the things it speaks to is the right to strike. Now, we all know that many of the public sector unions we do not have the right to strike. In OPSEU, we have the right to strike selectively.

Last year, I had the people talk about privileges, I had the privilege of co-ordinating the largest college strike in this country and that issue was over the quality of education and what we are doing with post-secondary education. We had some very dedicated people behind us and we had the right to strike. There are a lot of people in this hall who know what happened to us and the ILO spoke to it. They said to us what Ontario did was wrong when they shot that strike down and they legislated us back to work. That was very wrong. But let us take some measure of hope from what happened there, because you all know what happened about six months later, the Conservative Party of Ontario, after 42 years, lost power and I submit to you that one of the reasons that they lost power was because there were a lot of people like me who went out and worked for other parties to defeat them.

That is the right that every worker in this hall should have, as now in the private sector. It must be extended so that every government in this country knows that somewhere down the road we are coming to get them to change that government and to bring in governments which will permit the workers to have full collective bargaining.

MR. W. PRESLEY (OPSEU-NUPGE): I would like to give the delegates a personal example of how the restrictive legislation of Ontario takes away the fundamental rights, far beyond anything that most people understand as a conflict of interest within the job of a provincial employee and an elected office.

I was nominated, in a rural township in which I live, to stand for election on council. I informed my employer, the Ministry of Revenue, and received no response from them until two days after the legal date for removing my name from the ballots. So I was forced to stand in front of the all-candidates meeting in my township and say, "Please do not vote for me, the Ontario government will not let me run for municipal office." It is a very restrictive legislation. It is not challengeable through the grievance procedure, although we are attempting to do so, and it has to be changed by political action and I urge you to support the resolution.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I do not see any other speakers at the microphones, so I am going to call a question. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence in GE-3, please show your hands. Any opposed? Motion is carried unanimously.

Before our next resolution, I would like to introduce Alvin Heaps, the President, and Lenore Miller, the Secretary-Treasurer of the RWDSU who are sitting over here. I would also like to introduce Brother Lynn Williams, the President of the United Steelworkers of America.

Chairperson of the Committee.

MR. D. BEAN (Government Employees Committee Chairperson): The next resolution we will deal with is GE-6, amended:

"WHEREAS Canada and all its provinces have ratified the International Labour Organization Convention 87 concerning Freedom of Association and the Right to Organize; and

"WHEREAS the ILO's Committee on Freedom of Association has issued two reports in the last six months — one of November 1985 critical of the provincial governments of Alberta, Ontario and Newfoundland, and one in March 1986 critical of the provincial government of British Columbia — for imposing legislation which unduly restricts the collective bargaining rights of their employees; and

"WHEREAS these reports contain specific recommendations on how all four provincial governments could amend their public sector labour legislation to have it conform to Convention 87; and

"WHEREAS, to date, not one of the four provincial governments has demonstrated any commitment for implementing these recommendations;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC lobby the federal government to pressure the provincial governments of British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and Newfoundland to implement immediately the ILO's Freedom of Association Committee recommendations concerning their respective provinces."

On behalf of the Committee, I so move, seconded by Brother Findlay.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence of GE-6 as amended.

MR. J. SHIELDS (President, BCGEU-NUPGE): As a Canadian, I never thought I would ever feel ashamed to come from a part of the world that was condemned by the ILO but as a resident of British Columbia, I now live in such a place.

The experience of a government introducing legislation which fundamentally removes the right to collective bargaining without appearing to do so has created in British Columbia a situation that has raised the anger of all trade unionists.

What we experienced in British Columbia is a government that says, as an employer, they have the right to set up a commissioner that has the overseeing power to act in relation to any public sector trade union; where the government says it does not have the ability to pay more than it has negotiated; it can say to any arbitrator "you cannot consider anything other than the employer says is their ability to deliver on a wage package". And anything more than that an arbitrator cannot offer to a union.

In this province, in this day and age, we face the present legislation that has been condemned in other parts of the world that that we tend to look down on as dictatorial states. I am asking that this Convention support this resolution, that we not allow the erosion of collective bargaining rights, that the concerns of one sector of this union movement be the concern of all

sectors, and that not only do we take the resolution and call on the Canadian government to condemn British Columbia and the other governments involved, but that we urge all of our members to get out and work to defeat the kind of government that puts in this kind of legislation.

MR. S. LALONDE (PSAC): As a social affairs worker in Quebec, I do not want to be against the resolution as proposed. I would like to know why Quebec was not included in the resolution since our government has just about restricted our right to strike. That right is merely symbolic. Could the Committee give me an answer?

MR. D. BEAN (Government Employees Committee Chairperson): The resolution dealt with the ILO Freedom of Association Convention and dealt with the ILO Freedom of Association Committee which dealt with the reports of the four provinces involved.

I guess we could have included all provinces, because I think most of the provinces have some type of restrictions but that is not what the resolution dealt with, so we maintain the intent of the resolution which focussed on the reports from the ILO.

MR. A. BURKE (Vice-President, PSAC): I stand here, in full support of the Committee. However, I would like to give a little bit of a warning to the House of Labour. It says in here that the CLC should lobby the federal government but the whole trouble starts with the federal government.

Federal employees now work under the Public Service Staff Relations Act, an act that has the power to give the employer the full power to designate people who they say are essential to the safety and security of the nation. When we started, back in 1967, we had something like 30 per cent of our people designated. We are now well over the 50 per cent designated; we have gardeners taking care of gardens, the trees, the flowers, designated as essential and therefore not allowed to strike; we have groups in our organizations that are not only 100 per cent designated, they are now 105 and 110 per cent designated, positions that are not even filled here have been declared designated just in case they are filled during negotiations.

No doubt, you have to lobby the government, but keep in mind you are talking to an employer who employs the same policies as the ILO have condemned in the provincial governments. We took the federal government to task because of Bill C-124, the Restraints Act, we took them before the ILO and we won our argument. The ILO did not even have to come here to realize that the legislation was wrong.

MR. R. JONES (CUPW): I am up here on a point of order. I was at this mike twice now throughout the Convention and I was not recognized. I think that maybe it has something to do with the size of the hall or the lighting or something but it has also happened to other delegates sitting here at the back of the hall too. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Your point is well taken and I would ask the delegates not to mingle around the microphones if you do not intend to stand on the podium there and speak on the question or whatever resolution before you.

MR. K. GERROW (HEU-B.C.): It is a privilege and a pleasure for me, on behalf of our 26,000 members, to be in attendance at this Convention, this is the first time that our union has been at a CLC Convention since prior to 1970. In British Columbia, we have seen the ugly face of a wage control program, a wage control program that has brought concessions, that has brought the erosion of free collective bargaining rights for all public sector workers. This wage control program has been in effect since 1982 and in the public sector in British Columbia, we are now entering our fifth year of wage control. We have seen wage freezes. We have seen wage roll-backs, we have seen concession demands, and in our own union, we negotiated a 35-hour work week that was taken away from us by the provincial government wage control program.

It is a cruel and mean program. It means that those in new certifications cannot receive the prevailing rate of pay, it means that those who require legitimate classification adjustments will not get those classification adjustments, it means that women workers who are discriminated against by not receiving equal pay for work of equal value, they too will not receive proper treatment under this wage control program.

On March 31, this year, our collective agreement covering some 24,000 health care workers expired. Under that wage control program of Premier Bennett, we saw a number of concession demands: the employer attacked our sick-leave package, our vacation package, our medical plan, our dental plan, our group-life insurance plan, our extended health-care plan, our long-term disability plan. In fact the employer had $4,000 worth of concession demands on the bargaining table for each and every one of our members. And the most outrageous demand of all was a demand that our members pay a dollar per member per month to the provincial government negotiators and employers so that they can have union notice board. Over 50 concession demands have been placed on our bargaining table under this wage control program, and it has caused the members of our union to take strike votes across the province of British Columbia and we have received strong support from our members. It is not our first choice to engage in strike action, but indeed we will engage in strike action even if it means doing so during Expo 86.

The Hospital Employees' Union is strong and it is getting stronger now that it is part of the House of Labour, the Canadian Labour Congress. We fully support the CLC policies in opposing privatization, concessions, and attempting to settle the question of free collective bargaining in a real sense for all British Columbians and those under wage control programs. It may be that the members of our union will have to strike, it may be that we will have to call upon our friends in the CLC to support us, we think we can count upon you.

MS. L. NICHOLSON (CUPE): Along with the National Union of Provincial Government Employees, my union was one of those who asked for the ILO commission to come into this country, to come into Ontario in particular, because of the suspension of our collective agreement. We had a government in Ontario that completely suspended our collective agreement. They took away our right to negotiate.

If anybody in this hall thinks that having a commission come in will resolve any difficulties that we have, I am going to tell you that the commission may come down with a slap on the hands for the governments, but that is nothing to those governments. Where we have to work is at the ballot boxes, because, as long as we have governments that have the right to suspend collective agreements completely, we do not have the right of freedom of association. The NDP is the government that is going to see to it and I suggest to you that that is where the action ought to be.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I see no other speakers, I am now going to call the question. Those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence in GE-6 as amended, please raise your hands. Any opposed. Recommendation is adopted unanimously.

MR. D. BEAN (Government Employers Committee Chairperson): On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence in Resolution GE-7, seconded by Sister White.

> "WHEREAS the Public Service Staff Relations Act (PSSRA) is an outdated Act and is seriously affecting the right of public service unions to negotiate for important goals such as job security and technological change; and
>
> "WHEREAS the Act discriminates against the unions by allow-

ing the wholesale designation of employees to prevent them from striking; and

"WHEREAS the Canada Labour Code is much fairer and more appropriate than the PSSRA;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress support the scrapping of the PSSRA and the adoption of the Canada Labour Code as the appropriate legislation to govern collective bargaining in the federal public service; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC campaign for this change and pressure government to institute it as quickly as possible."

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee's recommendation on Resolution GE-7 is concurrence. Is anyone on the question?

MR. J. BERGERON (PSAC): I urge all the delegates to support this resolution unanimously. You find in the provinces a similar treatment to what the federal government did to its public service employees. But what the federal government is doing to the House of Commons employees is even worse. For five years now, we have been trying to organize these employees and are still working hard at it. This is not the first time that I bring up the subject; for five years, we have been running into a brick wall, and that wall is the government with its political and its legislative systems. These workers were told, in a recent decision of the Federal Court, that, although they serve coffee to the MPs and bring them messages, they do not deserve the same treatment as the private sector employees who deliver messages and who sell cups of coffee to the public. The House of Commons staff was told that they do not have the right to unionize, that they cannot belong to a union under the Canada Labour Code, nor under the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

The government is in the process of creating not two classes but a third class of persons without any rights, simply because they work for people who have been elected to the House of Commons to represent us, be they Conservatives or Liberals. These people enjoy rights while their employees do not have any. I therefore urge all the delegates to vote in favour of this resolution. I hope that in the near future the CLC will submit a brief to the House of Commons, asking the federal government to allow House of Commons staff to unionize and negotiate living and work conditions similar to those of other workers in Canada.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I see no other speakers, I will ask for the vote. All those who agree with the Committee's recommendation of concurrence resolution GE-7, please show your hands. Opposed. Carried.

MR. D. DEAN (Government Employees Committee Chairperson): Thank you Sister Chairperson. The next resolution is GE-9 and on behalf of the committee, I move concurrence, seconded by Sister White.

"WHEREAS the Saskatchewan government has ended its contract dispute with the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union through legislation, thereby avoiding its responsibility to bargain collectively with its employees; and

"WHEREAS the legislation invoked Section 33 of Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, in a legislative attempt to override the constitutional rights of the employees;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress condemn the Saskatchewan government for its disregard for basic trade union rights of its employees, and for its irresponsible attempt to deny its employees their fundamental rights under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms."

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence in resolution GE-9.

MR. L. BROWN (NUPGE-SGEU): I come from the province of Saskatchewan where the phrase "Devine rights" is taking on a whole new meaning in recent years.

On January 31, we saw another old phrase taking on new meaning when we saw Devine intervention in our province in the worst possible way. We had a collective bargaining dispute where a settlement was legislated for our union. I am not here to flag an individual provincial concern except that there are some national issues on that. We think that Premier Devine's particular career is going to be short and unhappy, but there are some national issues involved in that dispute that I want to bring to the attention of the delegates.

First of all, in that particular dispute, the government chose to legislate not the means to a settlement but the settlement of a dispute. That is highly unusual. Thank God, it is fairly rare. We were only able to find another precedent, going back 20 or 30 years in the Province of Ontario. That legislating of a settlement sets a new and dangerous low of government intervention into collective bargaining. The government of Saskatchwan, unfortunately though, also went beyond that. We have, of course in this country a Charter of Rights and the Court of Appeal in Saskatchewan has interpreted the Charter as meaning that trade unions have the right to collective bargaining and the right to strike in our province. The Charter also has an override provision, which says that the government has the right to legislate notwithstanding the Charter. Our government unfortunately was the first government in Canada to use this section of the Charter to intervene with a particular piece of legislation and say that their legislation will stand, notwithstanding the Charter or guarantees or the freedom of association and the right to strike.

Our provincial government swept aside the Charter, swept aside the guarantees in the Charter, swept aside the Constitution of Canada, in order to legislate our union back to work. There is no overriding concern in the province except for the "poll" position of the Devine government. There were no problems in the province, there was no crisis in the province, except the political standing of the Devine government.

He intervened in our dispute to bail himself out, and for that reason alone, we had our government use the "override" action in the Canadian Charter. That was not the way the section was meant to be used. We are challenging that use of the override and we hope for the help and support of the rest of the Canadian labour movement in doing that.

The right to strike, as we have found several times in our province, is a very fragile thing. Government can either legislate across-the-board, as they have done in some provinces, or they can legislate workers back to work on a case-by-case basis. A government that has increasingly decided to take away the right to strike of their employees must know and they must know with the help of the Canadian Labour Congress and all the delegates here that there are serious, I hope fair, consequences for them when they do that.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence resolution GE-9 please show. Any opposed. Adopted. Chairperson?

MR. D. BEAN (Government Employees Committee Chairperson): We will now deal with GE-12 as amended.

"WHEREAS the strike weapon is the most effective weapon that workers can have in their dialogue with their employers; and

"WHEREAS, knowing this, many large employers and their governments withhold this weapon from as many workers as possible, including tens of thousands of employees of the federal and all provincial sectors; and

"WHEREAS especially now when governments are determined to cut back not only many conditions of public sector

workers, but thousands of other jobs as well, it is critical that these workers have the right to strike;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Convention urge the CLC Executive Council to initiate a campaign, in co-operation with provincial federations of labour, to compel the federal and provincial governments to grant their employees the right to strike in the Canadian Constitution for all workers."

On behalf of the Committee, I so move, seconded by Brother Findlay.

MR. R. COUSINS (N.W.T. Fed. of Labour): I would like to suggest to Brother Bean and his Committee that he make an amendment because I know that I cannot make an amendment from here.

The reference in the resolution is made to federal, provincial and municipal government employees and I would like Brother Bean to pencil in territorial employees as well in the resolution and whereas.

MR. D. BEAN (Government Employees Committee Chairperson): The Committee accepts that suggestion, we will include territorial governments.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence in Resolution GE-12 as amended on the microphone.

MR. J. CLANCY (NUPGE-OPSEU): If we are to stop the trend to contracting-out and the privatization of valued public services, then we need strong collective bargaining. Now, in the absence of the right to strike, what public sector unions have developed is the ability to run strong and effective campaigns. What we want to do is link up all work in the area campaigns with the right that all working people should enjoy, that is the right to withdraw services.

I urge the delegates and indeed the executives of the Congress to place this issue high on the agenda with governments of the day and again, I say, remind governments that it is 1986 and not 1906.

MR. P. IETSWAARD (NUPGE-OPSEU): I am a jailbird. Back in 1979, we did not have the right to strike but we took it. Sean O'Flynn, our leader at the time, went to jail for this. It was about the same time that Jean-Claude Parrot also went to jail. This is the kind of stuff that we have to stop. We have to have the right to strike so that we don't get down on our knees to the government and beg for a decent standard of living. They claim that they cannot give us the right to strike because we are essential services.

This includes clerks in our unions, are they essential? This includes ambulance drivers, who could be essential. However, working besides them, after they privatized the ambulance service, the private ambulance drivers and workers have the right to strike. What is the difference? They do the same job.

Doctors in this province are threatening strike action, are they not as essential as the clerks in this government? Are the doctors that unessential that we can let them go out on strike and yet our clerks who do the paper work are so essential that we have got to keep them in, we have got to keep them down.

I would ask all the affiliates to support this resolution and that the CLC executive put it high on the agenda and let us get the right to strike for everybody in Canada.

MR. M. HURLEY (NUPGE-OPSEU): A lot of the delegates do not appear to be following the debate on the question of the right to strike and I can understand that many of them would be bored with the topic because, six years ago, this Convention adopted a resolution which called for the Labour Congress to act upon a major campaign to deliver on the right. This resolution, while it is very important, in that it reiterates that the right to strike is essential for all workers if they are to deal with the employers in these times; there also is some criticism which should be appropriately directed to the leadership of the Labour Congress for basically ignoring the public sector; and investing time in another tripartite endeavour, rather than working on fundamental trade union rights.

I am sure I do not need to tell anybody who does not have the right to strike what it means, but for those of us in Ontario working in hospitals, for those of us who work in other provinces and are either designated or do not have right to strike, in these economic times faced with contracting-out, faced with privatization, faced with lay-offs, faced with loss of jobs through attrition, through automation, there is no other way to deal with these problems unless we have the right to strike. I am not suggesting for a moment that anyone will give us the right to strike. I believe as we did in '81, as the Newfoundland employees did so wonderfully this year, the only way to take the right to strike is to walk and, of course, then they give it to you, but we expect your support when we do, and we expect you to be fighting for it now.

MS. S. VALLANCE (OPSEU-NUPGE): We are told in the Canadian Constitution, that we have rights as Canadian workers. Yet, governments of the day tell us that we do not have the fundamental right to withdraw our services when we have a dispute with our employer, but workers do exercise that right. When people say to me that the right to strike is outdated; I do not know of any other game in town, I know that when 5,000 Newfoundland workers took on the Peckford Tory government and marched in those streets every single day for nearly six weeks, they are going to win their contract, because they are willing to take it.

In Ontario, we have also gone through that: in 1979, the correctional workers in Ontario took their fundamental rights and marched on the streets.

In 1986, the doctors have said that they are in a dispute and that they are going to threaten the right to strike. Well I say to you as we always said in our union, if it is good enough for the doctors, it is good enough for the working people in the public sector.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called. I will test the house. All those in favour of the question being put please show. All those against the question. Question is to be put.

All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation on resolution GE-12? All those opposed. Motion carried.

I would ask, before the Chairperson goes into the next one, that the Committee on Health and Safety please come to the podium.

MR. D. BEAN (Government Employees Committee Chairperson): The next resolution is GE-10.

"WHEREAS legislation to protect employees who report wrongdoing by their employers would benefit all employees of the federal government, its boards, commissions, agencies, departments, Crown Corporations, or of any organization, business, group or activity financed in whole or in part by the Canadian government;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress support legislation to protect public sector employees who report wrongdoing by their employers; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC meet with private sector affiliates to explore whether similar legislation should be proposed to cover private sector workers."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence with resolution on GE-10, seconded by Brother Findlay.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee's recommendation is concurrence with GE-10.

MR. T. LITTLE (NUPGE-OPSEU): I rise to urge the floor to unanimously support this resolution which is protecting those public employees who point out wrongdoing of their employer. It is a particularly disgusting piece of legislation we have to deal with in Ontario, which suggests that public employees can say noting with regard to information that came to them because they are public employees; and, if you take that to its logical extreme, it means that I cannot speak to the person at the desk next to me about a particular issue at work, because that information came to me because I am a public employee.

And when a number of our brothers and sisters in Ontario, and I am sure in other provinces, go before the press, go before their neighbours, go before hearings and committees, they take their jobs in their hands,when they talk about jail over-crowding, or pollution, at the hands of the government, or any number of issues that the public has a right to know. This should be a fundamental right of all employees to point out these kinds of wrongdoing, because, as public employees, we are the protectors and the servants and we are there to speak in the public interest. Legislation which says that we have no right to do that should have been done away with generations ago. So I urge people to unanimously pass this resolution and protect those people who are trying to protect you.

MS. L. CASSELMAN (NUPGE-OPSEU): This resolution is speaking about an oath of secrecy which governs the employees of the public service.

The Saskatchewan federation put this in, but it affects all government workers and it affects everyone in this room because you are taxpayers.

The point I wish to raise with the Congress is that I would wish you to lobby at the federal level because we are getting the same answers at the federal level from the NDP, as we are getting at the provincial level. They agree with us when we ask that we are able to speak out on issues that affect us as employees because the government is our employer.

But the NDP, both federally and provincially, are saying; yes, we agree, but you cannot speak out about what goes on in your own ministry.

I work for Community and Social Services. So, according to the NDP stand on this, I have to speak about what goes on on the highway, in the OHIP offices, inside the psychiatric hospitals. That is not my field; we need a strong position from the CLC to change the NDP's position on this because we need them behind us. They are there part of the way, but they are not there the whole way. If we are going to make changes, tell the public how their dollars are being spent, misspent, abused, then we need their support and we need it totally.

MS. B. BYERS (NUPGE-SGEU): Saskatchewan Government Employees Union in June 1985 sent to both our Premier and the Leader of the Opposition draft legislation on the Whistle Blower Act. We would like to claim that we made up the legislation. However, we did not; we drafted it on the basis of the Michigan Whistle Blower Legislation which protects workers there. Both of the major parties in Saskatchewan gave a very interesting idea which has some merit.

As President of SGEU, I am regularly approached by our members to say: "I have information about what is going on in my department. I know of someone who got their hands in the till, a government minister who is not living up to his own policies, or whatever." When they come to us with that information they say "If we tell the public about this, if we give our commitment to the public and not to a political party, can our jobs be protected?"

What I say to them is we think they should give out the information, we will do everything we can to protect them, but certainly, because of the oath of secrecy that they sign, we cannot guarantee that. What that meas for the person is that the minister responsible from the department could be dead wrong or something, he could be found guilty in a court of law and the employees could still lose their jobs for breach of confidentiality. We think that is completely unacceptable.

We think that all employees have their responsibility first to the people that they serve, and that is the public. We do not think that we are the servants of a political party. All provincial governments, the federal government, all employers in the private sector, also need to live up to theirs. We want people to support Whistle Blower Legislation.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): As I told you yesterday, I have staff people trying to make sure of the fairness of when the speakers are going to speak, can I ask you not to change your microphones, or the places where you stand, because you are listed in rotation of the way you come up, I also have to go pro, con, pro, con. One of the last speakers missed his place, missed his opportunity to speak to the Convention, because he changed microphones and his rotation number was listed somewhere else. I just ask you to make sure you do not move from the microphones where you first stood. I will now call on microphone six.

MR. G. MOWATT (NUPGE-BCGEU): In British Columbia, we are presently negotiating our contract and this is one of the clauses we are attempting to have in our new contract.

As in all the other provinces, government employees are made to give an oath of secrecy so that we are not allowed to tell about the wastage of government and government policies which waste the resources of the provinces. We know of millions of dollars that have been wasted by our employer by inefficiency and by some political decisions made. We are using this clause in order to get around the legislation in our province that prohibits the productivity increases that our members require and also deserve.

I urge all the delegates to support this resolution so that we as government employees can get on and get proper pay for proper work.

MS. C. MICKLEWRIGHT (BRAC): I rise in support of this resolution. I want to tell you about the atrocious situation that happened at Vancouver Airport when a group of employees worked for a cleaning contractor hired by Transport Canada.

The employees who were initially unorganized were represented by the SEIU and, during contract negotiations, talks broke down. During that same period, the employees were aware that their employer was defrauding Transport Canada. The employer was claiming that certain employees were reporting for work at the airport terminal, but, in actual fact, they were going downtown to clean other offices. The employees were concerned about this. They met with Transport Canada and reported on their employer. The employer said that such was not case. Transport Canada then put in cameras to monitor the operations of this contractor. The result was that when the contractor's contract with Transport Canada expired, at the same time that the employees were out on strike for better wages and working conditions, Transport Canada cancelled the contract of that employer, took on another cleaning firm, a non-union cleaning firm and those unionized employees who were on strike and had reported on their employer for misbehaviour and defrauding of the government lost their jobs.

It was the position of the airport council in support of those employees that Transport Canada should insist that the new contractor must take over the employees of the old operation. That was not done.

It is a travesty that this continue to happen and it is a similar situation with all of the contractors at the airport. The workers must be protected, they must have the right, everywhere, to report on the wrongdoing of an employer and not to lose their jobs as a result.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I see no other speakers on this resolution. The Committee recommend concurrence in resolution GE-10; all those in favour, please indicate raising your hands. Opposed. Motion is carried.

MR. D. BEAN (Government Employees Committee Chairperson): The next resolution is GE-14. On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence with the resolution GE-14, seconded by Sister White.

"WHEREAS this is a time of rapid technological change in the workplace; and

"WHEREAS there is a need for continuing education of all employees; and

"WHEREAS public sector employees are not permitted to participate in Canada Employment and Immigration programs for education assistance, which as taxpayers they support;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress lobby the government for changes which allow public sector employees the same access to continuing education as private sector employees."

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Recommendation is concurrence on resolution G-14. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation please show their hands. Opposed. Motion is carried.

MR. D. BEAN (Government Employees Committee Chairperson): The next resolution is a composite resolution to cover GE-15 and GE-17.

"WHEREAS the federal government has embarked on a campaign to reduce its workforce by at least 15,000, but more likely 40,000, federal public service employees in the next five years; and

"WHEREAS the federal government is engaging in 'privatization', 'contracting-out', and 'devolution to other jurisdictions' of work now performed by federal public service workers; and

"WHEREAS many provincial, territorial and municipal governments, have or will be following similar courses of action; and

"WHEREAS such action by the federal, provincial, territorial and/or municipal governments normally results in the lay-off of long service employees;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC, the federations of labour, and the district labour councils demand that the federal, provincial, territorial and municipal governments provide all public service employees with the opportunity of early retirement incentives including no actuarial penalty to the employees' pensions; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC, the federations of labour and the district labour councils demand that the federal, provincial, territorial and municipal governments provide the necessary financial assistance and training so that employees who would otherwise be laid off will be provided with other job opportunities within their respective governments."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence in the amended resolution, seconded by Sister White.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee recommends concurrence of the resolution.

MR. G. YETMAN (N.S. Fed. of Labour): I am the one who lost his place. Most of the delegates have not been talking on the right order of business, so I am going to have a crack at it and I hope you do not call me to order.

When you take the right to strike away from anybody, the collective bargaining system does not work.

I just want to say to the government employees of Nova Scotia those correctional guards should belong to CUPE and other unions. If they do not have the right to strike and if they are not under the trade union act, we do not want them and that is trade unionism.

What kind of economic nonsense does it make when one million and a half people are unemployed in Canada — and we live in a private sector economy — to have the federal government, or any other government cutting back on jobs and, more importantly, on services.

This has a dramatic effect on unemployment. Ask the delegates from the other parts of the world that keep inflation down and unemployment down. When their private sector was down, they pumped up and put money in the public sector to provide jobs. What is Mulroney doing in Canada? I ask that you support this resolution; that you go back to every nook and cranny of this country and push municipal and provincial and federal governments to put jobs in the public sector, give us the services we need and help unemployment.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you brother. The result of the elections are in and we also have to then go into the next set.

I will ask if you could please sit down until we hear the results and take that next step, and then we will continue on with the debate on this particular resolution.

Brother Laberge.

ELECTIONS OF OFFICERS

MR. L. LABERGE (Chairperson, Elections Committee): Sisters and brothers, here are the results:

Number one, Daryl Bean — 2,541 votes
Number two, Gérard Docquier — 2,514 votes
Number three, John Fryer — 2,466
Number four, Jim Hunter — 2,534
Number five, Jack Munro — 1,849
Number six, Jean-Claude Parrot — 1,107
Number seven, Huguette Plamondon — 2,438
Number eight, Jeff Rose — 2,532
Number nine, Bob White — 2,523

It is my pleasure to declare elected as General Vice-Presidents; Daryl Bean, Gérard Docquier, John Fryer, Jim Hunter, Jack Munro, Huguette Plamondon, Jeff Rose and Bob White.

Nominations are now open for fourteen Vice-Presidents-at-large.

First of all, I would like to congratulate those that have been elected, I want to assure them of my full support during the next two years.

MR. J.C. PARROT (President, CUPW): I also want to thank my supporters. I think we can stand very proud of having carried a very positive campaign at this Convention.

I want to reassure everyone that I am committing myself to continue to pursue the work within the CLC to ensure that we are going to continue to have full participation and full affiliation whether at the CLC, the Federations of Labour or District Labour Councils. We are committed to continue to support the struggles of all the workers in this country that are going to come out of the next two years, as we have done in past, and we are going to continue to work very hard because the next two years are not going to be easy to all of us. And again, congratulations to those who have been elected.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): Thank you. Nominations are now open for fourteen vice-presidents at large, amongst whom you have to vote for at least six women. When you hear your names, please come up front.

Roxie Baker — United Automobile Workers
Reg Basken — Energy and Chemical Workers' Union
Val Bourgeois — International Association of Machinists
James Buchanan — Canadian Paperworkers' Union
Charles "Bud" Clark — Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers' Union
Léo Gérard — United Steelworkers of America
Louisette Hinton — United Food and Commercial Workers
Jean Lavallée — F.T.Q. Construction
Kathy Maddison — Office and Professional Employees' International Union
Brenda Makeechak — Public Service Alliance of Canada
Robert McGarry — Letter Carriers' Union of Canada
Lucie Nicholson — Canadian Union of Public Employees
Fred Pomeroy — Communications and Electrical Workers of Canada
Frances Soboda — United Steelworkers of America
Diane Wood — National Union of Provincial Government Employees

Any further nominations? Once. Any other nominations? Twice. Any other nominations? Three times. Nominations are closed.

Administration of oath to candidates for the positions of vice-president-at-large.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): You will see the numbers there on the screen.

Number one, Roxie Baker; number two, Reg Basken; number three, Val Bourgeois; number four, James Buchanan; number five, Charles "Bud" Clark; number six, Léo Gérard; number seven, Louisette Hinton; number eight, Jean Lavallée; number nine, Kathy Maddison; number ten, Brenda Makeechak; number eleven, Robert McGarry; number twelve, Lucie Nicholson; number thirteen, Fred Pomeroy; number fourteen, Frances Soboda; and number fifteen, Dianne Wood.

I would ask that, after you have your ballots picked up, you remain in the hall because we are going to bring the Health and Safety Committee back on, and it is very critical that you stay.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Point of privilege?

MR. B. WEISLEDER (NUPGE-OPSEU): As the lunch hour draws near, on this 100th anniversary of International Workers Day, I am extremely uncomfortable with the fact that this historic occasion with a street demonstration that proclaim the continuing struggle for a shorter work time, job creation . . .

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): That is not a point of information or point of privilege, and we did mark this day this morning.

We have a very long agenda. We want the Health and Safety Committee back on before lunch. I ask you to stay in your seats because I may not adjourn at that time because it is critical and I also indicated to you that I has several speakers at the mike, so we will now continue the debate on the resolutions.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' COMMITTEE

MS. B. SEED (CUPE): It is now 12:10 on May Day, which is the day of workers' struggle. There is a demonstration at the U.S. Consulate. I suggest that this entire Convention should go in it.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Sister, the Convention does not adjourn until 12:30 and I intend to carry on with the debate.

MR. P. FORDER (UAW): We are not only faced with a degree of cutbacks that savagely, adversely affect people of Canada, but we are dealing also with the hardship created by the number of jobs lost by an insensitive and uncaring government. And many of our people in this Convention may come to believe that cutbacks in the public sector are really something desirable; and they may feel that they do not have support from the public out there when you are trying to provide services to meet the needs of a country.

We, in the labour movement, have been doing some scientific surveys. In Ontario, we surveyed 600 adults three times a year; and we did an entire survey on the whole question of cutbacks, deregulation, privatization. We found, much to our delight, that people in this province, and I do not think it is different in any other part of this country, do not want to have the government cutting back needed services.

When we asked them if they wanted to cut back on services for the elderly, they said no. When we asked them if they wanted to cut back on services to the disabled, Canadians said no. When we asked them if they wanted to cut back on better education for our children, Canadians said no. When we asked them if they should cut back on the human rights program, they said no. When we asked them if they would be interested in cutting back on cleaning up the environment, they said no.

And then when we said, would you like to cut back on give-aways to corporations, they said yes. They said the corporations are taking an inordinate amount of money out of society and they are depriving services to people who need them.

In the labour movement, we want to build the kind of society where those who cannot fend for themselves get the kind of support that is necessary to live with a degree of dignity. We want to provide misery and human suffering with a degree of optimism and hope and we in the labour movement have been good at doing that for people who need assistance. On behalf of those young people who need jobs, for those who get slashed by an insensitive government, we can stand proudly before Canadians and say that these jobs, number one, are very necessary, and number two, they are very desirable.

You know Mr. Mulroney's policies regarding the economy are similar to Fred Pomeroy's monkey who was doing those deregulation ads, where the monkey was all wrapped up in that cord, well that is what happens to Mr. Mulroney and his Conservatives. They are getting strangled by that cord and they do not know where to go, and they are trying to say to people we had to cut the deficit. On that account they are going to lose as well.

On free trade, we have seen people shift from a position of support for Mr. Mulroney's sell-out initiative with the Americans, and likewise on the whole system of cutting back on the public sector, depriving people of needed services and in the meantime dashing the hopes of our young people who need employment.

This labour body, coming out of this Convention, will serve notice to this government that we are not going to stand for that kind of nonsense, we are going to stand up for the rights of people, I commend the Committee on this resolution.

We have to fight to protect jobs wherever they exist in the public sector and, in addition, expand the public sector because it is the public sector that provides the only services that we the people, the taxpayers of this country, will ever receive and they do wholeheartedly appreciate it. Let us stand up and be proud to say we work for Canada, we work for people and the public sector deserves a great deal of thanks for all of the jobs they do, because those are some of the very jobs that we as Canadians, find most necessary and sometimes not pleasant to perform; they as well deserve a great deal of thanks from this Convention for the work that they do in providing those services as well.

MR. D. GAGNON (PSAC-UPCE): I raise in opposition to this resolution and I will tell you why. It is very true that the government has already put in place a program to get rid of 15,000 jobs within the next five years. It is very true that these 15,000 jobs are our jobs. It is very true that by adopting that resolution in the House of Labour, we also agree that within the next five years these 15,000 jobs will be gone. It is very true that our people, are giving up right now. We are saying we will demand that the municipal government, federal government, help our people to leave the jobs.

We defy the so called early-retirement program. We have to fight this cut and reduction of jobs; not by allowing one way or another the government to proceed.

In my dictionary, the word layoff does not exist. When I go to the negotiation table with a priority to get a buy-out on behalf of members I represent, I will get a buy-out, and my members will lose their jobs and I am saying to you that this House of Labour, this Convention should instead stand up and send all the negotiators to the table with one priority: there should be no layoffs. Then I will say we represent our people.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I am now going to test the house. All those in favour of the question being put, please show? Opposed. Motion carried.

All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation please show? Opposed. Motion is carried.

I would ask the Committee to step down and the Committee on Health and Safety to stand. A point of privilege on mike two?

MR. G. STANCY (IWA): Yes. I would like to move that this Convention send a telegram of support to the 188 members of the International Woodworkers of America who have been on strike against Simpson Timber, an American employer, in Hudson Bay, Saskatchewan. They are picketing under an injunction and they are defying it by refusing to allow a train into the plant to remove a large inventory of lumber. The company refuses to negotiate until the train is brought in and loaded and then allowed out. A telegram of support will go a long way to boost the picketing workers in their fight against this employer who is trying to impose Alabama-style industrial relations to this crew.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you brother. We will do that. The Committee on Occupational Health has been called back and I would like to ask the speaker on mike two to have a few words to the Convention before they commence.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

MR. J. ROSE (CUPE): The issue of asbestos was shown yesterday to be a very passionate and a potentially divisive one. There is no quality more precious, and more evident, in this Convention than the unity of the delegates.

Conscious that the hallmark of our movement is unity within a framework of principles, the Executive of the CLC met after the session last night, and then again this morning to try to resolve this next question that was debated yesterday, and that posed an impossible choice, up to this point, for the delegates.

Now, the way we approached this, was as follows: The CLC presently has a policy that was adopted in 1982 that is clear and strong and unequivocal. That policy is for zero exposure to all carcinogenic materials. One cannot imagine a more straightforward statement than that. As we analyze what happened yesterday, we realized that many people who are in favour of the composite motion that was proposed by the Health and Safety Committee yesterday are in favour of it for reasons that are misunderstood by some people on the floor.

In fact they would prefer to stay with the existing policy. Furthermore, many people who are against the proposal that we brought forward yesterday are against it because they feel it waters down the existing policy.

We on the Executive became aware, as we thought this through, that there is unity in this room on the basis of unequivocal principles and that is the existing CLC policy whereby there can be no exposure to carcenogenic materials.

Aware that this is so, and feeling very strongly that the unity of this Convention must not be jeopardized, we then thought how do we handle this question? There is no obvious elementary procedure for withdrawing the composite resolution from this Convention, even though that is where our logic has led us.

Instead, the Executive has recommended unanimously to the Health and Safety Committee, that you will be hearing from in a moment, that they propose to table the matter. We want to assure you that the matter being tabled will not mean that it will be adopted in some other form. The matter being tabled will mean that we will stay with the status quo, which is the clear statement in favour of zero exposure to carcinogenic materials of whatever kind. The proposition will be put to you in the form of a tabling motion in a moment by the Committee. We hope very strongly that you will support it overwhelmingly.

On behalf of the Executive, we give you the challenge of unity, we put up a call for unity. Support us, and we can move on in unity to the rest of the items of this agenda.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I would like also now to call on Brother Louis Laberge.

MR. L. LABERGE (President, QFL): Sister Chairperson, of my own free will, without any twisting of the arms, I wholeheartedly agree with Jeff Rose.

We are getting divided on this very important question. It is true that the Canadian Labour Congress has already a policy that we can live with. Consequently, we decided to support this rule from the Executive Council in a gesture of solidarity in continuing to preserve the health and the safety of the people we represent in all our neck of the woods.

How could we say "No" to the officers that we just gave ourselves, this morning? It is therefore with great enthusiasm that I say "Yes, let us support the Committee's suggestion." Let us table the resolution; we can live with the already established policy of the CLC. All in solidarity, let us all go for it.

MR. C. GODBOUT (Occupational Health and Safety Committee Chairperson): We have just listened carefully to what has been said by Brother Louis Laberge, and this Committee has studied its possibilities this morning.

We are very proud to announce to this great Convention that unanimously, we recommend that this resolution be tabled and to go on with the present policy; seconded by Verna Ledger.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you brother. There has been a motion moved and seconded for tabling. I remind you there is no debate on the tabling. I will now put the question to you. All those in favour of tabling this resolution, please show. Opposed. The motion is carried. I am really proud of you brothers and sisters, for keeping this organization together.

MR. J. MARTIN (Steelworkers): The point of personal privilege is that I am proud to stand here before this delegation as a rank-and-file delegate and a worker fourteen years in an open hearth as a serviceman and I was greatly exposed to asbestos.

Again I thank you and the delegates in particular. On behalf of my members and those brothers that have died in my plant for how you dealt with that issue. Certainly when you go to the ILO that CLC policy will be fought and it will be fought hard. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you. The Convention is adjourned until two o'clock.

The Convention adjourned for lunch at 12:30 p.m.

THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1986
Afternoon Session

President Shirley Carr called the Convention to order at 2:10 p.m.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin, Executive Vice-President, CLC): Our first report, the Committee on Education, is about to start and we have a video that we would like to show, so if you could quietly take your seats.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

(Video on the work of CLC Educational Services)

MR. J. ROSE (Education Committee Chairperson): We would like to take about thirty seconds to commemorate an individual who has recently passed away, whose commitment to education was well known throughout our movement and whom we miss very much, Jim Brechin, the Director of the CLC Education Department, who passed away earlier this year.

Jim was a worker and a trade unionist from the age of 14. He moved from his first involvement as a steelworker in Hamilton, to an educator, to an education rep, then to Regional Director of Education for the CLC and, ultimately, National Director of Educational Services for the CLC. He was a born communicator, a super educator, and a very good friend; and we miss him very much.

And now, it is my privilege to move into the format of our report. We have a few composite resolutions to present to you and the first one will be presented by the Secretary of the Committee, Gord Wilson.

MR. G. WILSON (Education Committee Secretary): The Committee would like to present to you the first resolution, dealing with the content of ED-1, ED-3, ED-5, and ED-6, a composite resolution:

> "WHEREAS the public school system curriculum contains little or no information about the development and the role of the trade union movement in Canadian society; and
>
> "WHEREAS most participants in Canadian school systems will come into contact with the labour movement and its related issues during their working lives; and
>
> "WHEREAS a greater understanding of labour will lead to a more balanced view of the role of labour in our society; and
>
> "WHEREAS local labour councils have a responsibility to explain and promote the role of labour in the community;
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress develop a labour textbook, provide speakers' notes, distribute 'Notes on Unions', and other CLC material that can be introduced into the school system in Canada; and
>
> "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC assist the federations of labour to petition each of the provincial governments to establish a labour education program in school curriculums; and
>
> "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC encourage its labour councils to work with local boards of education with a view towards instituting these programs at both the elementary and secondary school levels."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence; seconded by J. Rose.

MR. J. ROSE (Education Committee Chairperson): It seems to us self-evident that these resolutions, all of which deal with labour education in our school system, could be composited in this way.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): The Committee's recommendation is concurrence in the composite resolution covering Resolutions ED-1, 3, 5 and 6, as amended.

MS. L. TORNEY (Metro Toronto L.C.): Labour education in the schools is not just a matter of studies on the labour movement.

When we started our labour education program with the Toronto Board of Education in 1978, we began by examining bias and we found lots of it. We found the statements that workers were lazy, that they lacked initiative, that the trade union movement was ruining the country. As we found the bias by omission, we found that when you studied history in school, you learned all about the explorers, you learned nothing about the people that paddled their canoes, you learned about the construction of the railway but nothing about the Chinese immigrant workers who came to this country and built that railway.

We discovered that there were portrayals of men and women that were sexist; and we discovered that there was nothing in any textbook or any reader offered anywhere which portrayed people solving their problems by collective action.

So it is much more than a labour studies program. It is what you do with the education of our children from the beginning to the end. What we did was design courses that corrected those biases. Why can workers and workers' children not have courses on science that include occupational health and safety? Why do math courses not tell you something about costing a collective agreement and bargaining? Why do the arts and music courses not portray workers' culture; such as you have seen this week with May Works. That is not in our school system. These things must be corrected, because what we are getting out of our school systems today are young people who have no appreciation, no understanding of the trade union movement of working people or the great contribution they have made to this country.

As a matter of fact, young people come out of our schools biased against trade unions. We have to work when we get them into the work force, to overcome all of what they have learned.

Well, we now have education programs in the Toronto Board of Education from kindergarten to grade 13. We are also working with the Board of Education from Scarborough, on the Board of Education for North York to institute those same kinds of programs. When we started this program, employers wrote to the Ministry of Education. We have seen copies of the letters and what they said was they were totally opposed to labour education in the schools, unless that labour education portrayed the way the trade union movement was ruining this country.

There were statements like: "the Eaton company had done more for social justice in this country than the union movement." Well we are beginning to have some successes in this city, and I urge you to go out and work for successes in your own community. One thing you must do is you must concentrate on electing Boards of Education, as we did in Toronto. At the time we instituted our program we had an NDP-controlled Board of Education in this city and that is what we must do, to do anything about the education of our children.

MS. F. RENGER (PSAC, National Component): It is about time our schools start teaching children that it is not only okay, but something to be proud of, to be a worker.

We teach them instead to be ashamed and that to have any personal worth, you must strive to be a doctor, or a lawyer. But workers are the people who have made our country one of the best places to live and it is about time our children were taught that. We must become involved, as the previous speaker has said, with developing courses and lobbying school trustees in all levels of government.

Most of the provincial governments and the federal governments that we have in power now would like to see things as they are, because children will not grow up with the sense of power they can have when they become united. It is very important and I hope this passes unanimously.

I would like to thank the brother who rose this morning and cleared up a misconception about the Schaeffer pens which I raised yesterday.

MR. B. GILMOUR (UAW, Canada): In this area of education we have not been getting through to the schools too clearly. The UAW is now moving in this area very well, so is the public sector and other unions. We must get into the schools. Our children must be told that unionism is the vehicle of social justice in this world. The churches or the politicians have not been telling people this. It is about time the unions told them and started to pat their own backs for a change. The churches are now stating

publicly their full support for unions. Let us take this message to the schools and let our children know that any country in this whole world that is without free unions is subject to poverty, dictatorship, no human rights. Let our children know it is the unions who make these contributions in the world to improve working conditions of people, it is the unions who improve human rights and who fight for social justice, peace and unity; the only way our youth will get to know the message on unionism is from us so let us do it.

MR. J. GUILD (Halifax-Dartmouth and District L.C.): All of us have an obligation to go back and follow through on this ourselves, supporting our labour councils, supporting the committees that are working for labour education in the schools, and doing our best to implement whatever materials come back from CLC in our own communities.

However, there are two other groups in which we individually can make a great contribution to reversing the kind of ignorance that exists in our schools and among our children about the true fact of workers and their role in social justice in the country.

If each of us talked to our own children regularly; if we have got an issue at home, at work, bring it in, talk it over at the dinner table. I was dismayed the other day to see on television a film of picket line of children outside of schools in New Brunswick who are screaming and hollering that the teachers were using them as pawns in their struggle. The fact was that the teachers were trying to get a new contract and actually were calling for a full lunch-hour free of supervision which was already in their existing contract. There were many ways in which the school board could have hired extra people, thereby creating new jobs, to do that kind of work and provide jobs in an area which have a very high unemployment rate. Instead, the school board people obviously marshalled these children, filled them with the story that the teachers were causing them to have to stay an extra half-hour in school. Now if we, the workers, were parents of these children, we would fill them in on this issue and just how workers are discriminated against so this kind of demonstration would not have been possible. Indeed the children may have been more active in supporting the teachers themselves and would have been picketing around the school board to say: provide enough people to do the job in the school.

The second group that we cannot ignore as individuals are the teachers. It is not enough to have the best text books in the world, the best curriculum materials in the world, if the teachers themselves are reactionary and have negative views on unions. So if you know teachers, talk to them, bring them up to date on your struggles, because they are facing the same kind of struggles themselves. Even though, sometimes, teachers do not recognize themselves as workers, we still have to let them know, as the education systems across the country are being cut back, that they are suffering just the way we have been suffering for years.

Here is a case where the members of an affiliated union, federation or labour council can do something on their own, in their own home and in their own area so that the children today and tomorrow have a clear idea of just whose side everyone is on in this country.

MS. J. MACMILLAN (NUPGE-NSGEU): This is not the most important resolution we will have seen this week, but it is one that comes up time and time again, at the CLC, at the Federation of Labour Conventions and at your own union conventions. And if there was no need in 1986 for this type of resolution, there would be no need for many of the other resolutions we are discussing here this week.

While I agree with the Committee's recommendation and do feel that it is important to petition provincial governments, I would like to tell the delegates about another approach and that is to use the workers in the school systems to get labour education in schools. And those workers I am talking about are teachers; teachers are workers just like you and I. In Nova Scotia, the province I come from, we have a committee set up to do just that. We are a committee of trade unionists and teachers and other interested individuals who are working to develop curriculum materials for teachers. We all, at times, are shocked and appalled at the remarks made in the newspapers or on TV which point out the depth of the anti-worker and anti-union feelings in our society.

While it is important to petition governments, if you are from a province like Nova Scotia, with an anti-union government in power, sometimes this is practically impossible and you cannot set much store by what an anti-union government like the Buchanan government is going to do, so I would urge all delegates to go back to their own locals, go back to their own areas and work with the workers in the school systems, the teachers.

MR. R. SLAGT (UE — Local 549): Maybe this is the most important resolution to hit this floor. If we go back to Monday morning when we started proceedings here, and we heard about all the things that we have to do against free trade, against privatization, against unequal pay, all of this kind of legislation, what we heard this morning about the fight to get the right to strike and the right to bargain back for public service employees, all of these things are rearguard action. We are trying to fight against something that is already in place and we are trying to change it. What this resolution is addressing is: forming the right attitudes to begin with. If we can do that, then we do not have to go out and try and change them; for it is much easier to do the job right in the first place than to have to go out and fight against the kind of things that have already been instilled and been incorporated in our children through the school system, or any other systems, over the years.

This is a very important resolution, that strikes right to the heart of the problem, whether you are talking about free trade or you are talking about peace, whether you are talking about equal rights for women, whether you are talking about anything, here is the place to begin it and here is the place to start, and maybe this is the most important resolution in this Convention. Let us support it, let us try and get it going.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): The question is being called. All those in favour of calling the question, raise their hands. Opposed. Motion carried.

It is a motion of concurrence, all those in favour of the motion raise their hands. Opposed. Motion is carried, so ordered. Chairperson of the Committee.

MR. J. ROSE (Education Committee Chairperson): We are about to move on to the next composite in document no. 3 but a small typographical omission has come to our attention so we want to add four words in English and about eight words in French, to make the last resolve a little clearer.

At the end of the very last line of that composite resolution, in other words, at the end of the final resolve, where it talks about 50/50 sharing of spending on post-secondary education, could you add the words please "at adequate funding levels", in French, "des niveaux de financement qui sont adéquats". Well now I will turn over the microphone to Gord Wilson to put it to you formally.

MR. G. WILSON (Education Committee Secretary): Composite resolution covering resolutions ED-4 and ED-10:

> "WHEREAS the federal government has signaled its intentions to limit the rate of growth of transfer payments to provincial governments in order to effect savings amounting to about $2 billion by fiscal year 1990-91; and
>
> "WHEREAS these cutbacks result in a significant reduction in the federal government support to post-secondary institutions over the next five fiscal years, and the total spending

on post-secondary education has already declined from 48.7 per cent in 1977-78 to about 43 per cent in 1984-85; and

"WHEREAS the provinces have well-established community colleges and training institutes, staffed by qualified instructors, that provide job-training programs geared to the available jobs in the community; and

"WHEREAS the federal government has been rechanneling funding away from established community colleges and training institutes and instead is increasing funding to the private sector for short-term job-training courses;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC call on the federal government to reverse its decision of increased funding to the private sector at the expense of community colleges and training institutes; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that federal transfer payments be allowed to increase in order to raise the federal contribution to a level which would correspond to a 50/50 sharing of spending on post-secondary education at adequate funding levels."

On behalf of the Committee I move concurrence.

MR. J. ROSE (Education Committee Chairperson): Seconded.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): Motion of concurrence in the composite resolution.

MR. G. BLANCHARD (NUPGE-NSGEU): I wonder if the delegates in the hall are aware that the funding for every province in three years time for adult education will be 60.2 per cent of what it was last year. That means two things: that our young adults are not going to get the opportunity for a quality education; and, secondly, the instructors that we have employed at the vocational schools and institutions are going to receive layoff notices.

Flora MacDonald has a great scheme. It is called the Canadian Job Strategy Program. Well the Canadian Job Strategy Program can be broken from four words to one word; that word is privatization. Do not make any mistake about it, they are going to privatize our jobs and the adult education training system in every province in the country, they are going to give it to scabs at half price. And it is happening in Nova Scotia now and it is going to happen in another province next month.

They are hiring scabs in Nova Scotia to take these programs, poor quality programs, at half price. We cannot allow that. That has to stop, we have to stop it here and we have to stop it by taking those Tories out of Ottawa. They are privatizing everything they can get their hands on. And we may have to wait three years but we better do it. It is repugnant to me when 57 of my instructors in Nova Scotia are on layoff notice because of that program.

MR. A. TOMLINSON (UFAWU): I want to speak to encourage the delegates to adopt this resolution unanimously. As far as post-secondary education in British Columbia is concerned, we will need further guarantees; and I would look forward to coming back here in two years to seeing that we will have a companion resolution to this one that we can endorse.

Let me explain what the problem is in British Columbia. Even as meager and unsatisfactory as the federal funding is, that funding does not yet get to the colleges and the institutes. Because of the Constitution in this country, the provinces have jurisdiction over education and in British Columbia the Social Credit government chooses to use that money for other purposes and does not give it to the colleges. This is one of the reasons why privatization becomes an attractive option for some people because they see that the colleges are dying on the vine. They are being starved for funds and they are not, in fact, being permitted to serve the needs and to perform the services that they have been equipped to do. And for that reason, I would like to encourage the CLC to come back next year with an additional resolution that will, added to this one, give education the kind of protection, the kind of recognition that it deserves.

MR. M. DUMLER (CUPE): The funding of education in provinces is not based on any fair, just or rational process. Also in support of the resolution, I think it is important to know that the private sector job-training programs are for profit. To my knowledge, they are totally unorganized, primarily by the nature of the instructors they use. They seek out instructors who are non-union in their orientation, there is a non-union orientation to the job-training offered, and we think we have to do everything possible to oppose turning job-training into a for-profit, anti-union program.

MR. R. BURNS (NUPGE-MGEA): For Manitoba, the CJS program will mean a cost of something like 40 per cent of the funding of job-training placements to the Community College in Winnipeg.

This is definitely going to mean layoffs, for the staff at the Community College in Winnipeg. In analyzing the program of the federal government towards post-secondary education, what you are really looking at is a plan to eliminate accessibility of education. For the community, eventually, we will be looking at a community college which will be very small in proportion to the necessary education facilities that should be available. So that means that there will be less access to the community college for the students. It will mean higher cost for those who can go on to post-secondary education; and, for the staff, it is going to mean layoffs.

The argument being given for the down-sizing of the educational facilities in this country is that there is not the money available, that we have to tighten our belts. So we are looking at a two billion-dollar cut-back in established program funding. At the same time, we can see companies like Gulf Oil picking up two billion dollars in tax breaks and running around to enrich their empire. So what we are really looking at is a Tory government which does not want to say that it is against education, because it could not get elected on that basis. It does not want to say that it is against having the children of the people who vote for them having decent education at a reasonable cost.

So what it does says: is "well we really are in favour of these things, but we do not have the money, so we are just going to have to cut back and will you bear with us until we get our economy in order." What the Tories really want to do is go back to 1910 when people, if they were ill, had to sort of beg around to get medical care; when they needed education, they had to go and scrimp and save or quit school early and go off and get any old job and be denied the possibilities to have proper training to get into some job at some place.

I urge the delegates to support this resolution. I took a look at the definition of Tory the other day in the dictionary, evidently Tory means Irish robber, and I think that is an appropriate definition for this government.

MR. L. BROWN (NUPGE-SGEU): I want to second the concerns about the Canadian Job Strategy because I think this is a very insidious program and the trade union movement has not yet grasped how dangerous the program really is.

It has been a catchy sort of title, it is called the Canadian Jobs Program. It has nothing to do with jobs. It has everything to do with dismantling the education system in Canada instead.

In George Orwell's book *1984*, he called that kind of logic double-speak. What we are seeing is a 40 per cent cut in post-secondary spending that will be disguised and not even admitted to as a cut, because it will be transferred to the employers to spend as they wish. We are going to have the employers directing the process of post-secondary education, almost half of it, in Canada. We are looking not only at the potential of losing 40 per cent of our existing jobs, we are looking at direct privatization of the education system. We have in our province something called

a computer college already. What that is is a private sector institution that gives the same training that the existing post-secondary institutions were already set up to give. They have no credentials, they have no claims to fame, they have no specifics except a catchy name and the right to get money under the Canadian Job Strategy Program. Another feature of it is that it will be employer-specific education, though we fought time and time again to make sure that education was for the benefit of the students. We are now going to see education for the benefit of the employers, they will not train people to do jobs, they will train them to do jobs in that specific workplace for that specific employer, so that their skills are not transferable.

Education will be destabilized, education will be deskilled, under the so-called Canadian Job Strategy. Also under this, they will be subsidizing employers to take "student trainees"; and those trainees will be learning nothing except how to take jobs away from permanent employees. And every employer in Canada is going to be able to get money from the federal government to move aside long-term employees and bring in so-called trainees to do the same job, the same work that other people used to do. They will get money from the federal government for it and the permanent employees will lose their jobs.

This is a class base to attack the education system because what they are attacking, by and large, is the blue collar educational system. The universities are not so far being touched by this so-called Canadian Jobs Strategy, only the technical institutions are. This is a classic example of baffle-gab. We have been totally mislead across the country about what this program really amounts to. It is time we, as a trade union movement, started to, first of all, understand the truth; secondly, to expose the truth to the Canadian people; and thirdly, then when we have got that base built, to work to reverse this so-called program which is really a dismantling of a program.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Martin): The question is being called. All those in favour of putting the question, raise your hands. Opposed. Motion carried.

The motion of concurrence as amended. All those in favour of the motion raise their hand. Opposed. Motion carried, so entered.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I am going to call Brother Laberge to the microphone, because we have the results of the election.

MR. L. LABERGE (Chairperson, Elections Committee): Madam Chairperson, brothers and sisters, here are the results for the election of 14 vice-presidents at large.

Number 1 — Roxie Baker — 2,397;
Number 2 — Reg Basken — 2,374;
Number 3 — Val Bourgeois — 2,384;
Number 4 — James Buchanan — 2,383;
Number 5 — Bud Clark — 2,396;
Number 6 — Léo Gérard — 2,308;
Number 7 — Louisette Hinton — 2,360;
Number 8 — Jean Lavallée — 2,343;
Number 9 — Kathy Maddison — 1,121;
Number 10 — Brenda Makeechak — 2,362;
Number 11 — Robert McGarry — 2,266;
Number 12 — Lucie Nicholson — 2,311;
Number 13 — Fred Pomeroy — 2,372;
Number 14 — Frances Soboda — 2,318;
Number 15 — Diane Wood — 2,213;

It is my pleasure to declare elected: Roxie Baker, Reg Basken, Val Bourgeois, James Buchanan, Charles "Bud" Clark, Léo Gérard, Louisette Hinton, Jean Lavallée, Brenda Makeechak, Robert McGarry, Lucie Nicholson, Fred Pomeroy, Frances Soboda and Diane Wood.

I would ask now all of the elected candidates to come forward in order to be sworn in. All those who were elected this morning as well as those who were elected this afternoon, please come forward, we have to adjourn tomorrow.

MR. W. PATERSON (Calgary Labour Council): Mr. Chairperson, do we not also have to nominate and elect the president of the various federations of labour for the Executive Council?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): No. They are members of the Executive Council because they are presidents of the Federations. They have to take the oath once they are elected by the Federation of Labour. At the first meeting of the Executive Council, after the Convention, they take the oath.

(Swearing-in of newly elected members of the Executive Council.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON (Mr. Laberge): I want to congratulate all of those officers.

I know that with the program you have voted during this Convention and that you will be continuing to vote, that their task will not be easy. But with the magnificent support you have given these officers, I am sure that they will work to the best of their ability in order to achieve this program. Congratulations.

Again, on your behalf, I want to thank all of the scrutineers for a magnificent job once again, and our friend Ed Johnston who, as if it was nothing, has always been able to organize that, so that it runs so smoothly, so efficiently that you think the scrutineers were working on their own. Congratulations to all of you and to the scrutineers.

It is my pleasure now to turn the gavel over for good to Madame la présidente and I sure wish you the very best success and you can always rely on our full and active support.

MS. K. M. MADDISON (OPEIU): I am pleased to see that the electoral process in the Congress still works and the democratic right to vote for a candidate of your choice is being given.

I would also like to thank those people who campaigned on my behalf, both from the Office and Professional Employees and from other organizations. You know there is an old saying: "If at first you do not succeed, try, try again". This is our second shot at it. In OPEIU we are not quitters, we may be back. Once again, I would like to say that I will continue my support to the Congress at all times.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you very much sister. I will ask the Education Committee for one more resolution.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. G. BLANCHARD (NUPGE-NSGEU): Madam Chairperson, I guess you were out of the hall, when we had a discussion on the Canadian Job Strategy Program. I would like to ask the Committee responsible for resolution L-11, how they could recommend non-concurrence after we had the discussion on document no. 3 on the Canadian Job Strategy Program. If someone would check into that for me please?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you, someone will check into it.

MR. J. ROSE (Education Committee Chairperson): We are going to do resolution ED-11 and then we are going to report on document no. 23.

MR. G. WILSON (Education Committee Secretary): Resolution ED-11:

"WHEREAS educational material available on ergonomics is almost non-existent; and

"WHEREAS proper ergonomics for all workers is crucial for a safe and healthy work environment;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress education department develop audio-visual aids on ergonomics."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence; seconded by J. Rose.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Committee moves concurrence on the question. I do not see anyone at the microphones. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence, raise hands. Opposed. Motion is carried.

MR. J. ROSE (Education Committee Chairperson): At the Convention two years ago, we passed a resolution, the details of which will be given to you in a moment, regarding the possibility of a real building to house the Labour College of Canada. We called it a Bricks and Mortar Committee, and we are very pleased now as a Committee to be giving you a report back on that 1984 resolution. This report is contained in document no. 23.

MR. G. WILSON (Education Committee Secretary): I will read the conclusions of the report.

"At the initial meeting of the Bricks and Mortor Committee, it became very clear that the Committee was confronted with a broad range of issues, most of which require a thorough and factual review, before we can respond to the actual feasibility of establishing a permanent residential facility for labour education. These include:

- Funding sufficient for the purposes of acquiring and/or building the necessary facilities;
- Requirement for a cost-recovery operating plan which insures sufficient and ongoing revenue for the purpose of defraying maintenance and operating costs;
- Questions related to the exact location and size of one or more residential facilities.

"These and related matters require considerable and technical study by persons experienced in the development and delivery of labour education and in the actual management of a residential educational facility.

"The Bricks and Mortar Committee recommends, therefore, the following:

1. An ad hoc technical committee be established by the CLC Executive Council;
2. The committee consists of experienced trade union labour educators;
3. The committee be charged with the responsibility of undertaking and/or directing the research and data-gathering required in order to confront the range of matters and related issues identified in this report;
4. The Committee be charged with delivering, to CLC Executive Council, a comprehensive report, complete with recommendation on the feasibility of and requirements for permanent residential trade union education facilities. This report would be presented to the next CLC Consititutional Convention."

On behalf of the Committee, I move that this interim report be received; seconded by J. Rose.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I do not see anyone on the question. All those in favour of receiving the document and information. Opposed. Motion carried.

I would ask the Committee to step down. The Maritime Transportation Committee please come forward.

Convention Guests

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): And while we are doing that, I would like to introduce you to a guest, visiting our Convention. Brother Arturo Valencia, the Canadian representative of Fenastras the National Federation of Salvadoran Workers' Union. Welcome brother, we hope that you are enjoying your visit with us.

At the same time I would like also to introduce someone else who is with us, Lupe Martinez of the United Farm Workers. There is a pamphlet entitled "Boycott California Grapes" which is being distributed and Brother Martinez asked that the pledge card which you find be returned to booth 20 after you have signed it. Brother Martinez is sitting up on the stage here. You are welcome and thank you for sharing your time with us.

Do you have a point on microphone 2?

MR. B. HORNUNG (NUPGE-AUPE): If you recall I raised the question of the Kids' Union letter this morning and I understand the Executive Committee's response to it. I would like the indulgence of the Chair to perhaps enlighten some of the members here with regard to what the Kids' Union is about and to make an appeal of contact and support for them. The Kids' Union of Canada was established approximately two years ago and has a current membership of about 25 children of school age with a gradually growing membership.

The Kids' Union itself is currently located in Calgary, Alberta. The objects of the Kids' Union are to bring school kids together and to educate them in the principles of co-operation and interdependance on issues relating to the labour movement, peace, eradication of poverty, hunger, illiteracy, and to make this planet a safe place to live for the present and future generations. These children have participated in anti-cruise missile demonstrations at Cold Lake, Alberta, and, last weekend, were in Vancouver for the same purpose. They have already appeared before various task forces and are preparing a brief to the task force on child care.

The Kids' Union is supported by concerned parents, some union locals and other individuals committed to peace. The Kids' Union expects and hopes to organize a national conference in 1987 and expects to approach Sister Carr to be one of the guest speakers.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, this is a point of privilege so please do not take too much longer.

MR. G. HORNUNG (NUPGE-AUPGE): I am almost finished. I just lost my notes here for a minute. These kids need encouragement, personal and financial support and I wish to appeal to all the delegates and their locals to encourage kids to join the Kids' Union and sponsor kids to participate in its activities. It is the only Kids' Union that I am aware of. If there are any other provincial organizations, and other locals who have interest in children I would suggest them to contact T.J. Ambridge at D24-1911, Spiller Road, Calgery, Alberta T2G 4G5. And if there is anybody here who wishes the address confirmed, come and see me up here.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I also want to advise the delegation that our Chinese brothers and sisters are on the podium and we will have a speech just upon the completion of the report of the Transportation and Maritime Committee this afternoon.

TRANSPORTATION AND MARITIME COMMITTEE

MR. J. HUNTER (Transportation and Maritime Committee Chairperson): We will be reporting to you under document 15, and we will begin by a composite resolution on shipbuilding and repair and I will read the resolves covering TM-3, 4, 6, 9-12, 16, 17, 20, 21, 25, 27 and 34:

"WHEREAS all industrial and maritime countries, with the exception of Canada, provide substantial financial assistance to the shipbuilding industry; and

"WHEREAS the Progressive Conservative Party, during the 1984 federal election campaign, stated that a top priority of a Progressive Conservative Government would be a more viable and prosperous shipbuilding industry and listed a number of proposals to this end; and

"WHEREAS the federal government, at a time when the shipbuilding industry is in crisis, has not only failed to implement most of their pre-election proposals, but also has discontinued the nine per cent Shipbuilding Industry Assistance Program and the three per cent Productivity Assistance Grant; and

"WHEREAS other shipbuilding nations are increasing their subsidies to the point of dumping, making it impossible for our industry to compete in our market, thus causing the worst crisis in our shipyards in a half a century, involving thousands of shipyard workers losing their jobs; and

"WHEREAS vessel construction and repair related to the fishing industry and off-shore resource development should be a source of much needed work in Canadian shipyards; and

"WHEREAS the federal government allows offshore supply vessels to come into Canada on temporary permits;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Convention of the Canadian Labour Congress demand that the federal government reinstate the Shipbuilding Industry Assistance Program at a level which enables Canadian shipyards to be on a competitive basis in the world market; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC demand that the federal government fulfill its pre-election commitment to creating a more viable and prosperous shipbuilding industry; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the federal government assistance be available on a continuing basis, thus allowing shipbuilding companies ample lead time in bidding for work, rather than on an annual renewal basis; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the federal government take steps, including legislative measures, to ensure that the construction, repair and modification of drilling rigs, drillships, platforms, supply and service vessels used in our offshore resource development be carried out in Canadian shipyards; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the federal government:
1. Restrict the issuing of fishing licences to Canadian-built and repaired/modified vessels; and
2. Impose tariffs and duties on repair/modification of Canadian vessels done abroad."

The Committee recommends concurrence and I so move; seconded by J.T. Saunders, Committee Secretary.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): A composite resolution dealing with shipbuilding and repairs; on the question I will go to mike 4.

MR. J. FITZPATRICK (President, SGWFBC): You know you have a problem in your industry when the boss comes to you and asks you for help. For too long the boss has been talking out one side of his mouth and the unionized people on the industry have been going on opposite directions.

We had 23,000 workers on the shipbuilding industry during the Second World War, the third largest shipbuilders in the world at that time, namely because shipbuilding was heavily subsidized; the price of a vessel was subsidized some 40 per cent. By 1975, our numbers shrank to 6,000 and the subsidy had shrunk to 20 per cent. To date, 1985-1986, our records indicate that we have 2,300 workers in the industry; 400 of them, right now, working in the industry; the rest are on short-term and long-term lay-offs.

On the West Coast in particular, in the last three months, we have had six shipyards close down out of a total of 14. so we have a crisis in this country of Canada, from St. John's, Newfoundland, to St. Catharine's and the North West through Victoria, British Columbia. And we have this crisis in our industry because of government policies. In the 1984 election, Brian Mulroney and Sinclair Stevens sent out local MPs to the shipyards with fancy promises of what they were going to do for the shipbuilding industry, and how the Liberal government had ditched us. They were going to double the import duties on the vessels coming in, they were going to make concessionary financing for domestic ship orders to build our vessels in Canadian shipyards; they were going to put a twenty-five per cent tax on fishing vessels coming into Canada over 100 tons in weight; they were going to do all of these fancy things.

Well, 20 months later, we are still waiting on them to bring in their shipbuilding policies; and, while this is happening here in Canada, we note that the multi-national oil companies are still securing their vessels or oil rigs, the supply boats or tugs off shore, and the reason they are doing that is that they can get concessionary financing, in the U.K. for example, at seven per cent of the total construction cost of a vessel. They can go to Japan and they can have their best vessel built for three per cent financial rates; and they can go to Korea and they will give them the vessels for nothing. That is how bad it is. How can the domestic industry here in Canada compete against financial concessions like that? It is impossible and that is the problem we face in the industry today. Speaking for the West Cost Shipyard Workers, we are mad as hell, and we are getting frustrated with this Tory government. We have taken to the streets in the last three months; we have had four major demonstrations in the city of Vancouver.

• We take on Sinclair Stevens; we had 300 shipyard workers around him when he opened Canada Place and Expo; Brian Mulroney was out there the week before, we had 300 shipyard workers around him and in fact we held him up for an hour. He was scared to come through our demonstration and when he did come through, he looked me in the eyes and I said to him: "Brian, what are you going to do about the shipyard workers in Canada?" he said: "I know about it, we know about it, we are working on it." I say: "Brian, do not give me any bullshit, What are you going to do for us?" He says, "I promise you", he looked me in the eye and he promised me that he would do something for the shipyard industry here in Canada. Sister Chairperson, when you and your cabinet get access to the Prime Minister, tell him about the promises he made to the shipyard workers across Canada, tell him that the shipyard workers want justice, we want jobs, jobs, and jobs, and justice.

MR. J. BELL (MWF, Halifax, N.S.): I rise in support of this important resolution. We talk here about the dangers of free trade and as I listened to that important debate at the first of the week, I thought to myself that there was something familiar with that situation and on hearing of the events that have been taking place in the various industries in central Canada, I put it together, and what did I come up with is that there is a situation in the East Coast where we had a new industry, the offshore oil.

That industry was made a free trade for everybody but Canadians. Canadians did not participate. The Canadian content was most limited, then there was a question of the Arctic development. When Joe Clark was Prime Minister of this country, he promised that, within five years, we would have at least fifty per cent of the traffic in the Arctic and now we do not have a vessel there.

Other foreign vessels go there as well without even asking permission of the Canadian government. We have a free trade in coastal trade; it is wide open. No maritime nation in the world has that same kind of situation. Now, in the shipbuilding itself, our companies engaged in shipbuilding have been behind in technology, have not made the necessary capital investments to keep up with the times so that the productivity of the workers cannot be competitive. The designs of the vessels we have built were not up to date, so that we were not competitive with the third generation container vessels and that now in some parts of the world are still in demand, notwithstanding the surplus of the large boat carriers and tankers throughout the world.

There is business to be done. The Chinese people want to develop their South China Sea and their North China Sea and oil. We can build the rigs and the supply vessels. The Soviet Union wants Arctic icebreakers, they are getting them done in Finland, and other European countries. And yet, we can do them, we built the last rig here, the Canadian company had to go into a subterfuge, because of the high interest rates that confront the shipyard builders here in Canada. They had to open up a dummy company in Bermunda where they were able to then apply as a foreign company and get a tax rebate, and interest from the Export Development Corporation at lower interest rates than they would have had if they had arranged to build that vessel while a Canadian firm. So the whole thing is nonsense. One per cent in interest is equal to five per cent in a subsidy.

The development of the Canadian shipbuilding industry provided at least three or four more jobs outside the yards throughout Canada. Shipbuilding takes in the results of the mines and mills of our country. It stimulates those mines and mills, it is the best job-creator that we can possibly have. Back in 1984, prior to this election, the Atlantic caucus of the P.C. candidates met together and agreed that that was so and they said that they would play for that in Ottawa. Here in Toronto, a month or so later, Brian Mulroney spoke to the Empire Club and agreed that shipbuilding was an economic stimulator; that the government should immediately use as a job-creator, to turn the economy around. He has done nothing about it. And we ask the Canadian Labour Congress to expose the hollowness of a bankrupt policy of the Mulroney government so that we can show the Canadian people that we are viable, we are capable and we can produce competitively with the rest of the world given the investment, given the tools and given the opportunity.

MR. J. MCLEOD (MWF): I agree wholeheartedly with the last two speakers and I also agree with this document. In the last 30 years or so that we have been coming here, the marine workers have been telling you people, this: Free trade started after the Second World War, in 1948. But they did not call it free trade; they called it giving away Canadian jobs. We are sick and tired of promises, promises and we get nothing.

I get so emotional that I get sick to my stomach when I look and hear what Mulroney says, what the other guy says, and it is all a bunch of bullshit. I want to apologize to the people here if I say something out of the way, but I get carried away. I would get on my hands and knees, I would crawl up the highest mountain if the government would do something for Canadian people.

For every shipyard worker that is out, there are three other related jobs; for every crew member that runs the ship there is another one out. It is about time we stood up on our two feet and did something.

Talking about the Arctic. We know the Yanks went up, we did not stop them, we were talking to the minister a few months back and we asked him for an icebreaker for Canada. He said we do not have the money, it costs $500 million. We told him you better see the multi-national companies in this country and get some of the money you poured into them for the taxpayers and start building so that we have something to protect the North. We have nothing, and we need about ten of them, those largest icebreakers in the world, that would employ the ship crews too, that would sail up into the waters and say it is not international. We in Canada own it but I guess we are going to sell it to the States. I do not know.

We come to this Convention and I am proud to come here. The Maritime Workers are proud to come here and I talked to Marine Workers across the country, not just the East end or the South or the middle. I am talking for them all because I know what they are going through. We have 25,000 workers, we have between 4,000 or 5,000 today and out of that 25,000 there will be 3,000 or 4,000 in related industries. Imagine the employment that this country could provide for the workers of this country.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): R. Clarke, member of the Committee.

MR. R. CLARKE (Transportation and Maritime Committee Member): I would like to first of all thank the Committee for bringing this matter directly to the floor because, over the last number of years, we have been very concerned and our concerns within the industry have not been heard fully on the Convention floor. The Committee has recognized the plight of our industry and certainly has brought the matter to your attention. I would also like to thank Madam Chairperson for the excellent support that she has given us since she has been associated with the Maritime Committee over the last two years and of her pledge of support in the future, because, as she pointed out, it is probably the most important issue that is facing us in our industry and it is also the backbone of many industries within the Canadian industrial sector.

We have a Tory government in Ottawa that is sitting back and allowing our industry to wither and die on the vine. They are just putting no support in it, we are presently operating at approximately 35 to 50 per cent depending on whatever repair jobs that might come in, and over the last couple of years, have been averaging 70 per cent unemployment. 70 per cent of our membership have been laid off for a year or better during the last couple of years. The prime problems lies with the Tory government. During the 1984 election campaign they had promised many, many things for the shipbuilding industry. They had promised subsidies, they promised to plug the loopholes. Instead, they have allowed the subsidy program to dry up, they have taken away the three per cent productivity assistance grant, and they are allowing our yards to die.

On the East Coast, we have four yards that have been put into receivership and bankruptcy within the last 18 months, three of them have been propped up — I say propped up, because it is a very short-term effect and we do not see some change to the shipbuilding policies in this country. On the West Coast, the picture is no better, there are three yards that are completely closed down. The talk is that there is a hidden agenda with the Tory government, to allow more yards to die. They seem to be very contented in allowing the work to go offshore and, as many speakers have said before, free trade has affected our industry for a number of years and it is not just one plant that will be closing if we do not see some action soon, we are going to see the complete industry in Canada die, you cannot keep the industry going without some form of support, we are the only maritime nation in the world that does not give a direct subsidy or loan or some form of support to the industry. We had the opportunity, and I certainly cannot say the fortune, the time, to meet with the Minister of Supply and Services.

He informed us that we certainly have to be competitive on the international market. Even our federal government intends, if the market is right, to go offshore. There has to be a cost placed on Canadian jobs. When we had a shipbuilding policy in Canada, it was costing the Canadian government approximately $4,000 per employee that was working in the industry. When we had the subsidy program, every yard was fully employed, plus it was bringing in many summer jobs. The cost that is being lost directly to the government today is approximately $12,000 a year Unemployment Insurance for those employees that are not working or about $5,000 per year per employee in income tax and an excess of $8,000 being lost indirectly to the loss of spending within our community. Where is the value of going offshore to have vessels built? I would ask not only that you support this resolution on the floor, but you take it back to your Members of Parliament, you take it back to your provincial legislators and demand that they re-establish a shipbuilding policy in this country.

MR. L. WALSH (MWF): The shipbuilding industry today is facing the biggest crisis in our history. Canadian shipyards from the East Coast to the West Coast are experiencing lay-offs of up to 60 and 70 per cent and in some cases more. A once proud

industry is now reeling and facing almost certain extinction. Something has to be done, and done quickly. We need support and action from our federal government. The first thing they have done was to completely eliminate the subsidies to our industry: the nine per cent shipbuilding assistance program and the three per cent productivity assistance grants. This was done at a time when other countries of the world are increasing subsidies and programs in their yards. This situation gives foreign yards a tremendous advantage over the Canadian yards. The next step taken by Ottawa was to continue to allow foreign vessels to come into Canada on almost virtually unlimited temporary permits.

What a farce! What a slap in the face to the Canadian shipyards and the workers! This cuts deep and offends the intellect of shipyard workers, and in particular the East Coast shipyard workers. Yet the election promises of the PC Atlantic caucus, dealing with the shipbuilding industry during the last federal election, set forth a position exactly the same as the marine workers. They were going to do all the things that were necessary to make this industry work.

Well, that was two years ago, and up until now, nothing has been done and the federal government does not have a concrete policy on shipbuilding in Canada. This is not only a tragedy to the industry, but a disgrace to Canada.

A once proud shipbuilding nation surrounded on three sides by water! To understand the mentality of this government and some companies, I would like to relate some information that was given to us last week. The Super Fish Company and another company in Newfoundland are in urgent need of a new fishing trawler for replacement program. This is a company that was formed and financed by the federal and provincial governments of Newfoundland and Canada. We have been told that this company will be requiring six new vessels within the next 30 months and 40 over a period of approximately ten years. Knowing full well the advantages of subsidies and programs, and the disadvantage that we have, in competing with foreign shipyards, this government, or these governments are allowing the companies to go world-wide tender to have these ships built.

How can anyone justify this course of action? So, I strongly urge you to support this motion and to get all of us in the shipbuilding industry back to work, make a decent living for ourselves and our families which is everybody's right in this great country of ours.

MR. P. OSMERS (CUPE): I would like to just encourage the people to support it because shipbuilding is a primary industry, the backbone of our country, which creates work for the unemployed in Sault Ste-Marie who have no place to sell the iron they are smelting. It creates jobs in our electrical industry. It is not only the shipbuilding industry; the same things are happening in the airplane industry.

So we have to go and encourage the government to support our primary industries, the shipbuilding and all the others, to create jobs throughout all of Canada.

MR. W. SCOTT (MWF): We have been making representations to the CLC for over 30 years on the question of shipbuilding and the plea of shipbuilders. Brother Fitzpatrick tells me, Sister President, that you have some salt water in your blood and that you see a new beginning as far as the thrust from the CLC is concerned and we are enthusiastic about working with you in our fight for attention from the federal government.

I was interested in the comment of one of the delegates who spoke on the education question, where he had researched the word Tory and found it to be an Irish robber. We have found the Tories to be makers of promises. Mulroney, prior to being elected, made some very elaborate promises to the Atlantic caucus that he had the best of intentions for the shipbuilding industry and he even outlined the kind of changes that he would make if elected.

However, since his election, we have seen nothing but the removal of conditions that we had prior to him becoming elected. And John Fraser, the Minister of Fisheries, prior to being tainted along with all the rotten tuna, came to Vancouver on the occasion of the launching of the "Martha Black", an icebreaker built in Vancouver, and he promised that, while they were embarrassed by the voyage of the "Polar Sea" through the North West passage, this government would get into that line of work and we would be building a vessel which would maintain Canada's sovereignty in the North West passage.

What we want to establish is that this government has to stop making idle promises and they have to stop reconsidering their policies with regard to shipbuilding. We have to take a strong look at the role that foreigners play in the shipping business of Canada.

As far as free trade is concerned, our natural free trade partner would be the United States, and in the area of shipbuilding they have their own kind of protection built-in, in the form of the Jones Act. So clearly, there cannot be free trade with the shipbuilding industry with the United States, they will be protected and we would be free and open. We want them to reconsider many aspects of their policies on shipbuilding. With respect to the coast guard, they have been contented to run with the policy that was okay between the wars where you built a vessel that would last for 30 years and where you refit the handicap to the fleet. Who can build a vessel, who can build anything nowadays, in this age of rapid technological change that would be effective for 30 years and yet this is the thinking that prevails in the Canadian coast guard. We have to pay a lot of attention to the role foreigners are playing and we have to change our policies with regard to our own fleet, we have to be recognized in the need to open the passage in the North. And you know the events of the last few days, where we see how difficult nuclear components are to contain in a domestic sense, and how difficult it would be to be contained if one of these nuclear submarines were to get in trouble while they are passing below our North West passage.

We have to look forward to the opening of the North West passageway, patrolled by Canadian vessels, built by Canadians and manned by Canadians not only for the security of the country but for the sustenance of the shipbuilding industry.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this? I am going to call the question and all in favour of the adoption of the resolution, please show your hands. Opposed. Motion is carried.

ADDRESS BY ZHANG RUIYING
Vice-Chairperson, All-China Federation of Trade Unions

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brothers and sisters, I am going to interrupt the debate now to introduce to you Sister Zhang Ruiying, the Vice-Chairperson of the All-China Federation of Trade Unions and a member of the standing committee of the National People's Congress. Sister Zhang Ruiying was a textile worker during the 1950s and later she was elected as a national model worker. During this period, she was also elected as the Chairperson of the Trade Union Committee in the factory where she worked. In 1973, she was elected Chairperson of the Trade Union Council of her province. In 1978, she was elected to her present position.

This is the first visit of Sister Zhang Ruiying, and her delegation to Canada. The interpreter will be Miss Huang Jing, Deputy-Secretary, Chief of the ACFTU International Liaison Department.

MS. HUANG J. (Interpreter for Ms. Zhang Ruiying): Respected President, dear friends, on behalf of the All-China Federation of Trade Unionists and its 80 million members, I warmly congratulate the Canadian Labour Congress on the convocation of its 16th Constitutional Convention and I also want to convey through you, our fraternal greetings to all your members and to all workers of Canada.

We would like to extend warmest congratulations to all the new leaders of the CLC. Your Convention is convened at a time of great significance in 1986. It is the International Year of Peace, declared by the United Nations and also the 30th anniversary of the founding of the Congress. The CLC is the most essential mass organization of the Canadian workers. You have been growing and developing and met your struggles to protect the rights and interests of the Canadian workers and assure them a fair share of the social wealth.

Over the past 30 years, the Canadian Labour Congress has been making unremitting efforts to uphold the rights and interests of the Canadian workers, improve their living and working conditions and safeguard world peace. You have also played a significant role in organizing your members to develop Canada's national economy and defend her national interests.

In international affairs, your Congress has pursued a policy of developing friendly relations with trade unions of various countries thus contributing to the growth of the international trade union movement. These efforts have won the CLC the place it deserves both in the social and political life of Canada and its national trade union movement as well.

As is known to our friends, China is a developing country. Now that we have thoroughly changed China's formerly backward economy, the Chinese workers, together with the rest of the Chinese people, are determined to build China into a modern socialist country with a high level of socialist democracy and culture within a comparatively short period of time.

The Sixth National Congress of the People's Republic of China of which I had the honour to be a member, held its fourth session in April. It approved a five-year plan of economic and social development. The new five-year plan stresses the necessity to continue to carry on the economic re-structuring with focus on cities so that we can make continuous progress in our efforts to build a proud, strong China and bring a common prosperity for all our people. The Chinese Trade Unions, as a mass organization of Chinese workers, are working hard to mobilize the broad masses of national workers to take an active part in the current economic reforms, guarantee they stay there as masters of the country, and give full scope to their role in the political and economic life in our organizations and to promote democratic management in enterprises to better fulfill the plan of economic and social development, so that the cultural livelihood of the entire Chinese people will, by consequence, be steadily improved.

There is a traditional friendship between the workers and people in Canada and China, almost half a century old; in those difficult years when the Chinese people were in their war of resistance against Japan.

In recent years, the mutual understanding and friendship between ACFTU and the CLC has developed steadily as a result of our concerted efforts. This is the common aspiration of the workers of our two countries, a cause with the common interest of our two peoples to benefit peace in the Asian Pacific Regions and the world over.

The Chinese trade unions have always attached importance to developing friendly relations with trade unions of various countries. They have pursued a policy of independence and brought contracts. We established and developed friendly ties with trade unions of various countries on the basis of independence, equality, mutual respect and no ideological interference into each other's internal affairs. In spite of our differences in international relations, in line with this principle, the Chinese Trade Unions have relations with trade unions of different political orientation in 120 countries and regions, as a concrete move on our part to uphold world peace. We hope that, although world peace and security are under great threat, the growth of peace factor is obstructing that of war factors. As long as people the world over persevere in their efforts, peace can certainly be insured. The Chinese Trade Unions want to work along with the CLC and trade unions of all other countries for a world peace and security.

In conclusion, I want today to warmly congratulate the great success of your Convention.

Now on behalf of All-China Federation of Trade Unions we would like to present a silk picture, it is about China's great war, to the Convention, as a memento to the 16th Convention of the Canadian Labour Congress.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brothers and sisters, on your behalf, I want to thank our friends for spending this time at this Convention with us. It certainly has been an experience for them as I have heard, and I want you to know that on your behalf, we shall be taking them on a trip across Canada, so they can meet with some of you and to see our beautiful country. Thank you very much.

And now we shall go back to the Committee for the next resolution.

TRANSPORTATION AND MARITIME COMMITTEE

MR. J. HUNTER (Transportation and Maritime Committee Chairperson): The next resolution is a composite resolution about the Canadian Merchant Marine, which covers TM-2, 7, 8, 18, 24, 29, 30, 31, 33 and 36:

"WHEREAS the abandonment of a Canadian merchant marine fleet by the federal government after the Second World War has left Canada utterly dependent upon foreign ship owners, who pay no taxes nor employ Canadian seafarers; and

"WHEREAS the re-establishment of a Canadian merchant marine would provide thousands of Canadian jobs, improve our balance of payments, bolster our trade, and enable Canada to become self-reliant in deep-sea shipping and marine policy; and

"WHEREAS the United Nations' Committee on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) with its recommended 40-40-20 formula for a shipping policy could be used as a basis for a Canadian Merchant Marine fleet as found in other maritime nations; and

"WHEREAS more than 200 Flags of Convenience vessels are beneficially owned by Canadian interests; and

"WHEREAS the federal government has proposed allowing Canadian businesses to charter or lease offshore vessels and their crews to operate in Canadian Arctic territorial waters if no Canadian ship is available; and

"WHEREAS the recent federal Task Force on Deep-Sea Shipping recommended against establishing a Canadian deep-sea fleet while the minority report of the labour representation on the Task Force urged such development;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Convention of the Canadian Labour Congress continue to support the re-establishment of a Canadian Merchant Marine with ships built in Canada and crewed by Canadians; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the UNCTAD 40-40-20 formula be adopted as a basis for re-establishing a Canadian Merchant Marine; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the federal government institute a program of repatriation of all Canadian Flag-of-Convenience vessels to be crewed by Canadians; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the federal government reserve all coastal shipping and offshore exploration activity for Canadian ships built in Canada and crewed by Canadians; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that government shipbuilding subsidies be increased to ensure that Canadian shipyards are in a position to build new and replacement vessels for a deep-sea fleet; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the use of public funds in the construction, renovation and purchase of any vessel, other than those built in Canada, be prohibited; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that adequate training be provided for seafarers, support staff and shipyard workers in this national drive for shipping identity."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence; seconded by T. Saunders.

MS. C. BAIRD (CUPE): I am proud to come from a seafaring country myself. At the present moment, there are thousands and thousands of boats going around the world, boats under Panamanian and Liberian flags, boats that are unsafe, boats that are dealing with cocaine, boats that are foundering on our shores causing oil slicks, threatening our wild life and inevitably threatening us, because of pollution, and this is because of the dreadful state of the shipbuilding industry and the deplorable state of the marine industry.

Thousands of men are trained every year as mates, as captains, in marine capacities. They are forced to go to the Caribbean and other places because they cannot get jobs in Canada. They work under deplorable conditions in cockroach-infested boats, for their lives are not worth a penny. This is a deplorable disgrace, we have to get at the Mulroney government and I trust that you and the newly elected executive will make this your top priority concern.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you sister. Before I recognize the next microphone, would the Committee on Energy Policy please come up to the platform?

MR. D. FORSYTH (CBRT & GW): If half these resolves can be achieved in the next two years, it will put the shipping industry back on a basis that we can at least have a part-time merchant marine. If we get into shipping as we propose it here, the shipyards and the ships would create thousands upon thousands of jobs in this country.

During the war, with the shipbuilding, the shipping and the seamen that sailed the ships, there were hundreds of thousands of jobs available for people in this country. We became aware of free trade in 1948 when owners sold their merchant fleet. China built a large portion of its merchant fleet on the transportation of grain from the West Coast to China. They know the necessity of having a merchant marine to take their products from China and import products into China in their own fleet. We do not seem to have that kind of sense. We are in a situation where it took us three years before the Canada Employment and Immigration to convince them, that we had seamen and dredges and officers to man vessels in the Beaufourt Sea, our own waters.

We are looking at a nine billion-dollar deficit on the transportation of Canadian products exported outside our country, none of it is left in Canada for seamen or shipbuilding or anything else.

We look at the United Nations Committee on Trade and Development and the 40/40/20 formula. What it means is that 40 per cent of your exports go out on your ships, 40 per cent in the country that imports and 20 per cent is left on the open market. If we were exporting 40 per cent of our products on our ships, we would not have the unemployment situation we have. We have flags of convenience vessels whose home port is Vancouver, running from Vancouver Island to the mainland, down to Los Angeles and San Franciso, carrying pulp and paper products. They are manned by Norwegians, English, etc., but there are no Canadians employed; and there is very little repair work done on those vessels in Canada.

We have a ship coming into Vancouver in the next few months. Someone with a research grant bought a ship in France, has taken it down to Chile to have it renovated, is taking it into the United States to have all the latest electronics put on. Nothing is being done in Canada and yet it was taxpayers' money that allowed somebody to buy the ship. Again, I want to reiterate that if the CLC and the Maritime Committee are successful in implementing half of these resolves, is will see the unemployment in this country drop significantly.

MR. M. DOESBURG (Iron Workers, Local 721: When I first heard discussions around the last resolution and some of the discussion around this by some people who are obviously very knowledgeable about this area, I was somewhat reluctant to speak. However, the union that I come from, Iron Workers, Local 721, is a direct recipient of the struggle that is referred to in the first "whereas". That "whereas" speaks of the destruction of the Canadian Merchant Marine. Well, there was more than just the Merchant Marine that was destroyed, there was also destroyed a militant democratic trade union that set a standard and raised the living standards of workers on the East Coast, the West Coast and in the Great Lakes.

I commend the leadership of this Congress for making real genuine steps towards forging unity and taking a mature position on many issues. I think that the membership here showed a lot of maturity on the asbestos question, which could have potentially split this Congress apart. I think that we have come a long way. I think that if we are going to learn anything for the future, we have to learn from the mistakes of the past and I wholly agree with all the "whereases" in the resolution, except the first one. I agree with the steps which I think, if implemented, would give the kind of Merchant Marine that a great country like Canada deserves. I have to say that first whereas is partially inaccurate. The trade union movement unfortunately co-operated with the companies and the governments, because some of the leadership in the CSU was of a political persuasion and there was the lack of the norm acceptable to the trade union leadership at that time. We have dealt very effectively on racism and sexism, and I think it is also about time we realize the mistakes that were made on both sides and the great debilitating effect that McCartheyism had on this trade union movement. The CSU is not the only union that was passive, there were others, and I would say that the trade union movement was poorer because of it.

I hope that we can learn from our mistakes and that we can project that experience into the future so that we can stay unified and take on the people that are trying to destroy us. You read the literature from the Business Council on National Issues, the National Citizens' Coalition, they are not interested in sitting down with us and negotiating tri-partite deals. They are out to destroy us.

MR. T. KOZAR (NUPGE-BCGEU): I believe that the anger that Canadian people should have at the government of this Canada for not having a Merchant Marine, should be immense but I know that it is not, and perhaps that comes from not remembering history.

During World War II, Canadian crews risked their lives to take materials and troops to fight in the war in Europe, on Canadian ships. Workers in the shipyards of Canada kept the flow of ships coming down the ways for the war effort. For the war years, Canadian sailers and Canadian shipyard workers won their colours on that task and provided the nucleus for the establishment of a Merchant Marine after the war was over.

Our ships flew the Canadian flag and ranked with any in the world and the crews that sailed them delivered supplies to fight the fascists in Europe and in other theatres of war. They faced incredible odds of getting through but get though they did, despite the North Atlantic and the torpedos from the submarine of Hitler wolf packs. The war time Merchant Marine, built and sailed by Canadian workers, could not be sunk by enemy submarines but they did not survive the scuttling of the fleet by the Canadian government after World War II. This Congress debated the issue of privatization, the other day, with great vigour and opposition to what seems to be a recent phenomenan. The liquidation of the

Clark steamship company, which held the registry and ownership of the Canadian merchant fleet during the war was a neanderthal act and a classic example of industrial indifference perpetrated by the Liberal government of Mackenzie King and Louis St-Laurent. It was the method with which the Liberals strangled the life out of the young Canadian Merchant Marine and shot down our shipbuilding industry at the urging of the government of the day. There were more than one sweetheart at those times.

That movie was a jerky black and white of the same ones we see today in the push towards privatization and deregulation. The federal government sold the ships of the Canadian Merchant Marine to Canadian corporate interests for a penny on the dollar. They promptly registered them offshore, tore the Canadian flag from the mast and put them under flags of convenience of countries you have never heard of, and then replaced Canadian crews with foreign crews. The killing of the Canadian Merchant marine by the Liberal government parallels the killing of the A.V. Roe Company by the Diefenbaker government when he traded Canada's aviation industry for a Yankee Beaumark missile and the selling off of the DeHavilland to a foreign power by the Mulroney government.

Canada is a maritime and a trading nation. Its exports are immense and the wealth guaranteed by the Canadian workers in processing those resources should wind up in the hands of the Canadian workers who process those resources and who build and sail Canadian ships. I do not spell patriotism "pay" as do the likes of Brian Mulroney, Sinclair Stevens and the gang that passes itself off as the Government of Canada.

I want to see the Canadian flag again at the mast of Canadian ships of a re-established Merchant Marine carrying Canadian goods to the world market, crewed by Canadian workers and built of Canadian steel, mined and milled by Canadian workers.

I urge the delegates to support this resolution on the re-establishment of the Canadian Merchant Marine as an integral part of this Congress's economic policies, to put Canadians back to work and place that demand on the federal government whoever they are.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called. I will test the house. All in favour of the question being put, please show your hands. Opposed. Motion is carried.

All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence in the composite resolution dealing with the Canadian Merchant Marine, please show your hands. Opposed. Adopted unanimously. Thank you very much.

I would ask the Committee now to step down so that we can go to the next one.

MR. L. HARRISON (UAW, Canada): I just wanted to announce and say thank you to the delegates that raised $700 by buying the arts that come from Chile for the political prisoners and that money will go back to the workers in Chile and feed those prisoners that are in that jail in Santiago.

MR. R. MERCIER (Secretary-Treasurer, CLC): CALFAA will have a picket-line at Terminal 2, Malton, at 7:30 tomorrow morning; and would welcome the participation of CLC delegates.

MR. G. CALLENDAR (IAM): I am concerned about resolution TM-28 which concerns over 2,000 Canadian National jobs in the city of Moncton. We came all the way here to have that resolution debated or put our points forward to the floor and I would like to know if it is coming.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Yes, I hope to have that Committee back brother.

ENERGY POLICY COMMITTEE

MR. R. BASKEN (Energy Policy Committee Chairperson): We wish to deal with the Emergency Resolution No. 3. It was presented to us this morning from a caucus of the National Union of Provincial Government Employees; and the Executive Council referred it to the Energy Committee. We made some adjustments and attempted to cover the subject, recognizing that we were not going to become instant experts on this particular problem:

> "WHEREAS the recent nuclear disaster in the Soviet Union has resulted in loss of life, environmental damage and health problems that could affect residents of the region well into the future; and
>
> "WHEREAS the impact of the disaster is being felt as far away as Poland and Scandinavia; and
>
> "WHEREAS the Chernobyl disaster is the latest in a series of nuclear accidents that have occurred in several countries over the past 10 years;
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress urge the Government of Canada to:
>
> 1. Call upon all countries to immediately provide for international inspections and safety standards to secure solid evidence that such an accident will not recur; and
> 2. Offer technical and other assistance wherever possible."

The Committee recommends concurrence and on behalf of the Committee I so move, seconded by Jack MacDonald, Secretary of the Committee.

Certainly this disaster is of world-wide importance and is of very strategic importance to all of us. Your Committee does not intend to be instant experts, on the question of nuclear disaster, nor do we expect the delegates to this Convention to understand all of the ramifications of the requirements for clean-up and all of the things than can happen. What we are asking is the endorsement of a resolution that says that we are concerned about the health and safety of the environment and the people in the vicinity; and certainly the health and safety of the whole world; not just this disaster, but with other things that happened from nuclear plants.

We think that this resolution expressed the concerns of our Committee and expressed adequately the concerns of the Canadian Labour Congress and does not add and inflame any dispute but attempts to show our concern and resolve the problem.

I urge you to support this resolution unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Emergency Resolution No. 3, concurrence recommended by the Committee.

MR. F. TAYLOR (UAW, Canada): I rise in support of this resolution and I would like to add one more thing in there if we could get it, and that is to help find a solution to the problem of nuclear waste.

I talked to people about this before and they do not know whether they are going to bury it or burn it or what they are going to do with it but if they bury it and the future generations of the Canadian people find it, what are they going to do with it?

MR. B. WEISLEDER (NUPGE-OPSEU): I think that this is an exceptionally weak resolution although it is a very timely one. It addresses a concern that I am sure is global in nature considering the scope of the disaster that occurred in the Soviet Union over the last few days.

It seems to me that in, addition to calling for inspection procedures and safety standards, which of course we can only recommend, we cannot enforce them on an international scale, this resolution, in line with I am sure past policies adopted by previous CLC Conventions, should come out clearly and straightforwardly for the phase-out of all nuclear generation plants. It seems to me that this is an inherently dangerous and destructive technology; it seems to me we are playing with the lives of humanity, if we do nothing, if we do less than advocate the wholesale phaseout of this technology. It seems to me we have

to come to grips with the fact that our own government is marketing internationally nuclear technology, attempting to sell CANDU reactors to countries like Argentina, Turkey and Pakistan and elsewhere.

It seems to me that the fundamental problems associated with nuclear waste, and the instability of the whole process of energy generated by nuclear means, is sufficent to convince every sane individual, certainly every working person, that this technology is something that should be denounced and that should be phased-out within or own border and internationally.

What is it going to take, how many thousands will have to die through repeated accidents, not only low-level radiation emission but melt-down, horrible explosions that will send the waste product out over large territories and vast populations.

The Committee has an opportunity to bring something to this Convention which really made a strong statement in opposition to a form of energy generation, a form of technology which has demonstrated within the last few days how utterly destructive, how insane it is as a form of energy-generation, and I think nothing short of the kind of condemnation of nuclear technology should be accepted by this Convention especially in the context of what has happened over the last few days.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Chairperson of the Committee wishes to respond on that.

MR. R. BASKEN (Energy Policy Committee Chairperson): I would like to deal briefly with the question of nuclear waste and other things.

Our attempt in this resolution was not to cover and make policy or overall policy for the CLC nor to neutralize the policy that is already in effect. The resolution is intended to show our concern over the immediate situation.

I refer you to our document of 1980 and the Energy Policy Statement on nuclear energy, which adequately and completely covers the questions that have been raised, the question of development of nuclear energy, the question of storage of waste, and the question of health and safety. All of that was covered in 1980 and certainly it is not the Committee's intention to minimize, neutralize or otherwise lower the grade of that particular policy.

Our intention is to simply cover this immediate situation and we urge your concurrence.

MR. D. HEFFERNAN (CUPE): CUPE local 1000 represents all the people who work for Ontario Hydro across Ontario including 4,000 people who work in nuclear power stations within the province of Ontario.

I personally work in a nuclear power station. I am a mechanical maintainer and I work at the Bruce power station, on the shores of Lake Huron. I do not want to get into all the differences that are involved with nuclear reactors around the world. Suffice to say that they are many, many different types of reactors. The type that Russia is using is not the type we use. In fact, they are of a type that has been phased-out mostly by United States and England. The differences in the reactors are so great that to do a comparison is the same as comparing apples and oranges.

I believe that the system that we have, the CANDU system, is the safest system that they have in the world. The Atomic Energy Control Board here in Canada has come up with very strict regulations requiring us to have back-up systems upon back-up systems. We have systems that have many systems for the shutting-down of the reactor, we have other systems which are for the cooling of the reactor; we have others for containment in the event that something should go wrong.

I am not saying that everything is totally rosy with the AEC and the Ontario Hydro. We have our differences, like everyone else does in the area of occupational health and safety, and in the area of exposure levels. We have been working very hard with the CLC's Health and Safety Committee and we work in conjunction with the Steelworkers and PSAC, trying to get changes into the Atomic Energy Control regulations to make things even safer for people who work in these stations. I think it is a good thing to have an international agency that could develop international standards, and I hope that these standards would be equal to the standards that the AEC sets for our radiation, or for our nuclear power stations here in Ontario.

It would be a good thing if these international agencies had the power to go and police these places, and to do something if standards were not met. I think our power stations here in Ontario would not have any problems meeting these standards once they were developed.

The other side of all this is that it is very important that the people of Ontario and the people around the world could feel confident in nuclear energy knowing that there was a policing out there, keeping an eye on it and making sure there were standards that would be acceptable to all.

MR. W. BROWN (CUPE): This is just another example of the scientific world continually telling us over the last 20 years that nuclear power is safe.

I will remind the delegates about the Three Mile Island fiasco in the United States. Now the truth is coming out. It was very, very close to a disaster, at least to the one we are facing today, and certainly the disaster that nearly occurred in England in a highly populated area of that country when they nearly had a melt-down on another established nuclear power station.

I do not trust the politicians of this world because they keep on telling me that if they build more nuclear bombs, it is going to be safe. Well, I do not buy that one and I do not buy completely the scientific world and I especially do not buy the fact that a lot of nuclear power stations are controlled by private companies especially in the country to the south of us.

We have never trusted private enterprise with our jobs and I do not see why we should trust them with selling this energy, particularly energy that is made under their conditions, and by their friends. I realize that, in the union I represent, there are a lot of people employed in the nuclear industry. Whether we produce it by nuclear power or conventional, those people are going to have jobs, because we are going to need power. I just feel that we should be much more careful.

I read a few months ago about this particular project in Russia where it is supposed to be one of the safest in the world, and that was in an American scientific magazine and not a Russian. I believe that we should be very careful and I believe that this resolution is incorrect in saying that we should give the Soviets ever piece of assistance. I do not believe that, I will accept that, but I think that we should not offer. My main theory is that this may well be the beginning of the war, seeing what happens when we lose control of energy and when we lose control of the use of nuclear energy both for peaceful and wartime activities.

I urge that we turn this down and that we send back a much more strongly worded resolution to take completely out of the hands of any government the right to regulate this. It should be regulated by an international body completely and that would probably give us that right to go in and inspect these installations in any country in the world. I doubt very much if the Americans would let us go into their power stations and inspect and I doubt very, very much that the Russians would do so.

The one thing I find most distressing about this particular emergency is one country that has now announced that it is going to be nuclear energy-free in the next years is now a receptacle of the fall-out, and that is Sweden. They currently have an unemployment level of around two per cent and that says a lot for the way they run their country. I think that in our country it should be run similarly.

MR. I. GARNIE (NUPGE-BCGEU): I think it would have

been appropriate for other resolutions to have been submitted earlier for consideration by the Convention since the problems that they are addressing are long-standing problems.

If I have any criticism about the resolution before us, it is that it does not commit us, as the CLC, to do anything except asking the Tory government to do something. What I would like to do is to recount to you a little bit of what was presented to me yesterday by Brother Galesky of Polish Solidarnosc. He informed me that he had received communication from Poland that there is a critical shortage of consumable food in that country. One of their main problems would be the feeding of children and he was asking if we, in some ways, could help to provide powdered milk or flour, or food that is easily transportable and quickly deliverable. Another of his concerns was that we should not trust government agencies to deliver or to disburse this kind of aid. He was also leary about trusting the Red Cross, because he is not sure that they are an organization that have the great trust of the people of Poland. The only organization that he could suggest that has the trust of the people of Poland is the Catholic Church. And to that end, he suggested that we make any donation that we can through the episcopal commission and the Council of Catholic Bishops in Ottawa, And I would call upon the CLC here to make some form of significant tangible donation of food or money for food that can be quickly delivered to Poland to assist in maintaining the health standards of those people who are at the moment seriously affected.

MR. S. BECKINGHAM (CUPW): I oppose the Committee's resolution, Emergency Resolution No. 3. If this disaster had not happened, a couple of days ago, this resolution would not be on the floor.

For years back home, we used the argument that, if you worked at a nuclear power plant, the chances are you glowed in the dark, and that was the only way we could put it that, somehow, people thought nuclear power was great. It was only justified by our society as a spin-off from war to nuclear bombs. In order to build a bomb to blow up somebody, you have to have an economic means to okay it by the people, so you use the government to set up a form and they call that nuclear energy, and that is like having nuclear weapons all over the country.

We spoke here about resolutions dealing with terrorism and yet we have all these nuclear power plants just waiting for a terrorist. It is ironic, and that what has happened in the last few days to the other countries. We cannot say we are shocked, because if we did not know about it, if we did not know the after-effects then, we should not be here.

In Ontario, in Alberta, there is a great concern over what is happening. In Ontario, they are testing the fire after a nuclear explosion. They are testing the Cruise missile in Alberta. You have people out there today openly stating we can have a small scale nuclear war. Now back home, we call those people crackpots. You can call them whatever you want. They are stupid and we live in a system that says they are smart, they are geniuses, they are the best.

The technology we have developed over the years is for what? When you talk about technology, back home we call it the whoops! factor. It works, whoops! It is not funny, because there was a whoops the other day and we still bend towards technology, the resolution says so; offer our technical and other assistance wherever possible. Some of the assistance you will get from Canada we could do without.

We ask for international inspections. Back at the plant, some of the inspections we get are crazy yet we are going to send them over there to help out and we will look at safety standards. I come from New Brunswick, we have got nothing, we are going to send safety standards over there, they have the same standards we have, we have none.

We are just kidding ourselves thinking that we do, but there was one piece that I would like to have seen in the resolution that if you are going to put it out, put it out right; that is, ask the Canadian government to exchange technology so that it does not happen again.

MR. J. RUSHTON (UFAWU): I support the resolution. I think it puts the matter before us in as positive a way it can be in such a tragedy and a difficult situation. I think it is constructive, I think it raises many questions on which we can work on after this Convention is over; that it leads us to the conclusion that far more energy must be put into the whole question of freeing the world and the people in the world from the threats of such horrendous disaster that could descend upon us. Nuclear energy could bring down upon us a nuclear war, would most certainly bring it down upon us. It is clear that we must get this technology under control and in the hands of working people. The people in this world need to come together and decide what they are going to do with their future.

One other problem I see with the situation around nuclear energy internationally is that it is too secretive. It is too competitive. It is something that we are going to have to deal with internationally, for the safety of all workers. And if the workers decide they will not have it, they will not have it. But I think we need to exchange information, and get together in a much greater way. I think that what we should be doing after the Convention is seeing a way clear to set up some kind of communication between the trade unions representing workers in the Soviet Union, that are involved in this situation, with the workers here in Canada so that they can exchange safety information, real information as workers concerned with an international problem. I think that we have put it positively. We have a lot of work to do, and I think we should just carry on with it and hope that we can bring as much unity at an international scale to free us from the threat of nuclear war and other disasters and get on to build real lives for all working people in the world.

MR. W. LAVERY (ECWU): I would like to reject the emergency proposal on the basis that it does not have enough teeth, it does not spell out what people feel. I speak from experience.

Over the past 30 years, mainly in the United Kingdom, I was delivering CO^2 gas to nuclear power stations. This is a method that the U.K. uses for cooling reactors, the type of reactors is different, that is true, but the one thing that I find in common with all nuclear power stations is that the people walk about in white clothes, white hats, white gloves. They produce electricity.

Electricity is the same no matter by what method you produce it, but in a nuclear power station, there is a residue. The residue is the problem; one little spill and people are talking about limited nuclear war; we have got a first nuclear war on our hands here in Ontario, above ground. We have nuclear waste stored in metal containers that the residue is eating through and leaking on to the floors. Eventually, it finds itself into the table water then you find skin problems, etc., but it is all put down on things like acid rain, or whatever.

Nuclear waste is a big problem, and unless we attack that problem by refusing to endorse any nuclear generation, we will really be in trouble.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called. I want to put the question. All in favour of putting the recommendation before the Convention? Opposed. Motion is carried. I will now put the Emergency Resolution No. 3, Committee's recommendation of concurrence. All in favour, raise your hands. Opposed. Motion is carried.

MR. R. BASKEN (Energy Policy Committee Chairperson): Thank you, we will now move to document no. 4, the Report of the Energy Policy Committee.

The Energy Policy Committee met to consider resolutions EN-1 to EN-9 and wishes to report as follows:

Committee recommends concurrence with the following composite resolution to cover Resolutions EN-3, EN-5 and EN-8:

"WHEREAS the world market price of oil has fallen sharply in recent months; and

"WHEREAS Canadian consumers have not fully benefited from a corresponding drop in retail price of gasoline; and

"WHEREAS when the world market price of oil rises, the retail price of gasoline increases immediately; and

"WHEREAS the federal Crown corporation, Petro-Canada, was established to challenge private, often foreign, control in the petroleum industry;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress pressure the federal government to insist that Petro-Canada show leadership by reducing the price of gasoline at its retail outlets in line with lower oil prices thus forcing the multinational companies to follow suit; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC demand that the federal government conduct a combines investigation into the oil industry's rack price agreement and its failure to lower retail prices in response to falling oil prices."

The Committee recommends concurrence and on behalf of the Committee, I so move and seconded by Jack MacDonald, the Secretary of the Committee.

We have concerns in this area, and we put a composite together to cover three resolutions and we think we have done it rather well to show our disdain for the reaction of the multinational corporations and everybody else that sells gasoline, to their efforts to make a fortune off the lowering of the price.

When the world price goes up, their prices go up almost immediately. When the world price goes down, it has to go through the follow-through of the pipeline and the refineries and the trucks and the service stations, and the tanks and then the carburators and it takes a little while to get there and they give you a lot of excuses. There are other excuses, some of them real, the question of taxation, and how much taxation there is in the price of a litre of gasoline at the service station? There was all sorts of weeping and moaning from the industry about the national energy program. Then they got rid of the national energy program and the prices dropped and now they have something else to complain about.

But we think that we have covered the concerns of working people and the fact that oil prices internationally have gone down and we should benefit from that. We recognize that whenever you link your economy to somebody else's, like the oil industry, you are in trouble, particularly the oil companies are in trouble because they have linked their price to international prices, when they found that they could make a mint from it and they did for years. Our concern now is that when the prices go down, we should get some benefits from it; we urge your support for the composite resolution as proposed.

MR. D. ELVES (Edmonton and District Labour Council): I would like to thank the Committee for the recommendation of concurrence in a resolution which places the blame clearly on the transnational corporations.

In my home province, a major oil-producing province, there is at this time, because of our interest in a fair return for our non-renewable resource, some confusion in laying the blame on parties for the problem on the international oil price level. There is some confusion in a sense that there is blame being levied on OPEC. Now OPEC is simply an international agreement amongst some oil-producing countries in order to try to get fair return for their oil. If they are not as united as they should be in attempting to get a fair return for that non-renewable resource, that is the problem that the producing countries, many of them Third World countries, will have and which we can only hope that they will succeed in overcoming.

Too many times, we blame the oil-producing countries, the OPEC countries. I would like to submit that, in fact, the number of years during which the United States has been looking for an excuse to make threatening comments at Libya, comes from largely the fact that Libya is one of the oil-producing countries which more strongly demands a fair return for their product, as opposed to some of the other countries like Saudi Arabia, which mistakenly sees its interests as very closely tied with the transnational corporations. Of course the United States dislikes the independent stand of the Libyan government which is trying to use this non-renewable resource for diversification and for social housing and son on, to benefit its own people.

So I am pleased at the wording of the resolution and I hope that we continue to look to the transnational corporations as the source of the problem, not at those countries, including our own, which should be getting fair return for our non-renewable resources.

MR. G. SNYDER (UE): This resolution is good but it does not go far enough.

The last whereas talks about Petro-Canada being a Crown corporation, but in the resolves, there is no call for the nationalization of the oil industry. It is what we need, the Tories are going around telling people Petro-Canada is run in the sense of a business, for the corporation interest not for the public interest, that is why the price of oil is high.

So we must get it through to the public and I would ask the Congress to get a campaign going to tell the people what public ownership really is and the way it should be run, not the way it is being run presently. This is not being run in the interest of the public and the good of the people in this country which it was set up for, and the people who are being led to believe that this is what you get with public ownership.

I know there are a lot of people that are mad at Petro-Canada, in particular, because of the price being high, and I feel we have to get that message out, plus we must talk about nationalizing the whole industry, which this resolution does not do and I would hope that that could be included and somebody else would suggest to be referred to have that included.

MR. W. ZANDER (B.C. Council of Carpenters): There is something that I think we could miss and I do agree with the resolution as far as it goes. Considering all the cut-backs in the social programs, including unemployment insurance and everything else, that are taking place in this country, we should raise the question as to why in the hell they give $400 million or are about to give if they have not already something like $400 million, to prop up the oil industry in Alberta that has been ripping us off for as many years as it has been in operation.

We have socialism for the rich and private enterprise for the poor and I think we should raise that issue. I would hope that the Committee, even in a short consultation, could agree to put in an extra resolve in there that identified what kind of a problem, and why money should be poured into their hands; because on the one hand, we are saying they should lower the price at the pumps and that is fine and dandy, but they have the other pump in their hands where they are getting $400 million.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): If there are no more speakers, I am going to call the question. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence to the composite resolution, please show your hands. Opposed. Motion is carried and I would ask the Committee to step down.

UNION LABEL TRADES AND SERVICES

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Union Label Trades and Services Department, rather than having a heavily written report, has a video, which will go on now.

MR. L. RUFO (ITU): In regard that four resolutions have been submitted to this Convention as emergency and I would like to know what is the criterion used to determine them?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, you are out of order, if you are speaking about this last resolution, it has been dealt with, I am sorry.

The Committee, would you please put on the video.

MR. R. GILBERT (PSAC-GEIU): A point of order, Madam Chairperson. Will the Occupational Health and Safety group be back with us tomorrow to deal with resolutions?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We are going to try and get a couple of these Committees back on tomorrow, as you know the adjournment is around 12:30 but it depends on how many people are in the hall. We will continue to go as long as we have a quorum and try to get all the Committee work finished.

Video presentation on the work of the Union

Label Trades and Services Department

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): With the dedication of Brother Ian Reilly the Committee that deals with Union Labels, which works very hard, had a Convention last Saturday. I want to thank Brother Reilly and that Committee for having the foresight to have something like this prepared for you.

I also wish to let you know, and I hope that I am not wrong on this, that if you wish to have a copy of that, please see Brother Reilly or our Congress National Director of Organization, Brother Ed Johnston, and we will see what we can do for you. So on their behalf, I would like to accept that as their report with your thanks.

Are you all in favour of that? Anybody opposed to that? Thank you very much. I will now call this Convention to a close for today, reminding you of the festivities this evening, also reminding you that we start at 9:30 in the morning.

The Convention adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

FRIDAY, MAY 2, 1986
Morning Session

President Shirley Carr called the Convention to order at 9:05 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I would ask the Chairperson of the Credentials Committee to come forward and give the fifth report.

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

MR. I. REILLY (Credentials Committee Chairperson): The final report of the Credentials Committee:

Fraternal delegates	3
ICFTU representative	1
Congress Officers	4
Representatives of affiliated organizations	98
Officers and delegates from Federations of Labour and Labour Councils	108
Representatives from affiliated organizations	2,658
Representatives of directly chartered unions	8
TOTAL	2,880

Moved by myself and seconded by L. Nicholson, Committee Secretary.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The adoption of the Credentials Committee fifth report, anyone on the question? I see none. All those in favour of the adoption of the report, hands up please. Opposed? The motion is carried.

I will ask Brother White to give you the order of the day's proceedings.

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW, Canada): We will try and get a number of the committees on the platform to deal with some important issues in their reports, so we will be jumping around a bit this morning. The first committee to report will be the Organization Committee, then the General Resolutions Committee, Social Services Committee, Transportation and Maritime Committee, Health and Safety Committee and the Legislative Committee.

Committees will make some partial reports dealing with the matters that are of importance to this Convention, so we want the Organization Committee and the General Resolutions Committee on the platform immediately.

MR. LYSTER (CBRT & GW): On a point of personal privilege, Madam Chairperson. I would be remiss if this Convention did not get a vote of thanks to the staff for the excellent job they have done in supplying this Convention and helping us. Thank you, Madam Chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I appreciate that, thank you very much. And I know the staff appreciates that.

ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

MR. J. BUCHANAN (Organization Committee Chairperson): We will deal with the resolution that was referred back to the Committee, with some specific instructions, Emergency Resolution No. 2. Those instructions have been carried out by an additional "Further Resolved" and I will now read the resolution as amended:

"WHEREAS security guards who are members of the Steelworkers' Union have been on strike since February 26, 1986; and

"WHEREAS their employer, Burns Agency, has a contract with Air Canada; and

"WHEREAS Air Canada, in order to bust the union, agreed that Burns Agency cancel their contract and then signed a contract with Agence Metropole which has announced its intention of hiring scabs at the Dorval and Mirabel Airports in Quebec;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress bring all necessary pressure to bear on Air Canada and Labour Minister McKnight and demand that the right to unionization and collective negotiation be recognized for the security guards of Dorval and Mirabel; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all CLC affiliates also exert pressure on Air Canada in order that this Crown corporation put an end to its anti-union attitude and its discrimination; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC lobby the federal government, particularly the Ministry of Transport, to take over the responsibility of security and the screening of passengers at Canadian airports, withdrawing this responsibility from the airlines."

The Committee now recommends the adoption, and I so move; seconded by R. Bezo.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Is there anyone wishing to speak on this? I do not see anyone. I will call the question, all in favour of the adoption of the Emergency Resolution no. 2 raise your hands please. Opposed. Carried.

MR. J. BUCHANAN (Organization Committee Chairperson): Resolution O-7; it was the Committee's feeling that this would require a constitutional amendment as "the Resolved" specifies that the CLC grant to the district labour council the power to directly charter the unemployed workers' union:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC grant to the district labour council the power to directly charter the unemployed workers' unions and that these same unions be accorded all rights of affiliates to the CLC."

As this would require constitutional amendment, the Committee is recommending non-concurrence in Resolution O-7; and I so move, seconded by R. Bezo.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee's recommendation is non-concurrence with resolution O-7. I do not see anyone out there, all those in favour of the Committee's recommendation please show. Opposed. The motion is carried.

MR. R. BEZO (Organization Committee Secretary): The next resolution is O-8, which deals with organizing fish plant workers in the Province of New Brunswick and suggests that the Congress offer financial assistance to unions willing to organize non-union plants.

The Congress has a standing policy of assisting affiliates in attempts to organize union potential. At the present, the Congress is involved with unions having jurisdiction in the fishing and fish-processing industries in the Atlantic region, with a view to a more effective structure to deal with the new realities in the fishing and fish processing sector. The Congress is committed to its policy of assistance and will continue this policy.

Your Committee therefore recommends non-concurrence in resolution O-8.

I will read the Therefore Be it Resolved:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress takes it measures to give financial assistance to organize the non-unionized fish plants in New Brunswick."

I move non-concurrence, seconded by J. Buchanan.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Committee's recommendation is non-concurrence in Resolution O-8. Anyone on the question please? I do not see anyone. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please show by raising your hands. Opposed. Carried.

MR. J. BUCHANAN (Organization Committee Chairperson): Resolution no: O-9.

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC request affiliates to undertaken organizing campaigns in this province, or surrender the jurisdiction to a union interested in organizing the unorganized."

The Congress has no problem in having its affiliates organize within their jurisdiction where serious organizing potential exists. If there is evidence of any union failing to exploit organizing potential where a serious campaign can be mounted the Congress should be informed and it will take appropriate action.

Your Committee therefore recommends non-concurrence in resolution O-9, I so move, seconded by R. Bezo.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Committee's recommendation is non-concurrence in resolution O-9. Anyone on the question? All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please show. Opposed. carried.

MR. R. BEZO (Organization Committee Secretary): The next resolution O-10 deals with having the building trades in the House of Labour.

The Canadian Labour Congress has expended much time, money and effort, including changing its policy on numerous occasions, to satisfy concerns of building trades unions. Two of its officers, Vice-Presidents Mercier and Martin, have been assigned to work with building trades and other independents with a view to affiliation.

Your Committee recommends concurrence in resolution O-10 with one amendment, change the word "increase" to "continue" in the first "BE IT RESOLVED."

"WHEREAS governments and employers have indicated in recent months that they are determined to destroy unions; and

"WHEREAS the Canadian labour movement is presently divided by the dispute between the Canadian Labour Congress and the building trades; and

"WHEREAS only a strong and united labour movement can withstand the destructive policies of the government and employers;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC continue its efforts to have the building trades become a part of the CLC."

I so move; seconded by J. Buchanan.

MR. W. ZANDER (B.C. Council of Carpenters): I think this is an important resolution and I know it is the policy of the CLC, in its reminder to carry on in the same way. I have to fully support the resolution. I might say that it took us about three years to get back in the CLC and that effectively was in defiance of what our internationals wanted us to do and we expect several others, in the Yukon and Alberta, will follow suit some time later.

We will probably be again on the floor of our International Convention in early October dealing with the same issue over again. I want to say as President of the Canada Conference of Carpenters, which is the only organization that we have nationally in this country, that, although we have passed resolutions by secret ballot and motions to get back in the CLC, it is not moving our international too much to bring that about.

I do not think the international is interested in following that process of getting on with the minimum standards of self-government, as laid down by the CLC. Finally as President, I am told through the grapevine that there are some initiatives being made or have been made already with the building trades internationals. If that, in fact, is taking place, I would sincerely hope that those of us that have been in the forefront of fighting to get back in the CLC will be informed of what is taking place and it is not because I am paranoid, I want to assure you. I am concerned about the demands that the international unions have made on the CLC in the past, in order to get back in and reaffiliate. Some of the demands that they have placed on the CLC are totally unacceptable to us and I want to say to you very clearly that they are totally unacceptable to the building trades delegates.

I hope that there is consultation with others who are already in to make sure that there is not any slippage regarding delegates' status, resolutions and things of that nature, and the position on Canadian autonomy. We do not have to lessen our position on Canadian autonomy and we will be taking that again to the floor of our international.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Brother, I can guarantee you that you will be consulted and involved.

MR. M. DOESBURG (Iron Workers, Local 721): My understanding is that at least one of the building trade unions is trying on an organizational level to get back into the CLC and my hope also, in those negotiations, is that the CLC position on concessions and on minimum democratic standards of government are insisted upon. The CLC has shown leadership in that area. The Canadian Federation of Labour have shown that they are substantially a different kind of organization, as a creature of the federal government, and they have come out in favour of free trade. They have advocated concessions under some circumstances and the members are angry and they are looking for some leadership.

Right now, among the building trades workers, at least in the province of Ontario, there is a real anger at the international unions for trying to force concessions upon us and there is a real desire to get back into the Canadian Labour Congress and it is my hope that the CLC will do everything to get us back in and co-operate with those people who want to, but I hope that they do insist upon the maintenance of those standards of government and also for their position against concessions.

MR. D. ELVES (Edmonton and District L.C.): This resolution addresses itself to the issue on reuniting the union movement but I would like to address myself to the issue of how to go about reuniting during division now and the time when they formally

come back in, because there are techniques, developing unity of action even if we do not have unity of form yet.

The unity of action comes out of mutual campaigns. It is our responsibility to identify those issues and those particular campaigns on which we can unite. That is not just with the building trades but with a number of non-affiliates and, at the local labour council level, that is dealing with CLC affiliates who are not yet into the labour council.

Let me be specific with an example. In Edmonton, we are in the process of working out the details of a campaign for a civic fair wage clause and that campaign will be supported, we hope, as broadly as possible amongst our affiliates. But also we are appealing to the building trades in the vicinity and to some of our non-affiliates who are still CLC affiliates and other independent unions, to get involved in this. If we want to have support of this united labour council-initiated campaign, we can ask for donations for the particular campaign. Now this unity of action will develop towards unity of form while getting the affiliates and non-affiliates and others involved in unity of action and we will all get accustomed to working together.

We should be working on that unity, not just at the level of persuading chief officers or just persuading the rank-and-file, but the best persuasion is by showing that we are looking for techniques; and, eventually, unifying on a program of united action.

MR. T. NOEL (CPU): I think it is very important that the building trades be brought back under this umbrella of the CLC. I do not believe the problems that those people are confronted with are any different than ours. When we speak of how united we are, I do not think we are really all that united when you have such a great number of members out there who are separated and who are going in different directions than us.

To say that all the building trades people are in support of the Liberals or the Conservatives is not really true. We have people in this hall, under the CLC, who support the Conservatives and the Liberals as well.

So I think every effort should be made to bring those people back and we will all gain as a result of it. It will strengthen us all, because our brothers and sisters out there in the building trades are confronted with the same kind of cutbacks and recessions as we are.

I would hope that this resolution be carried and that you work on this very, very vigorously, and hopefully at the next Convention there will be some results and those people will be sitting in the same hall with us.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I will put the question now. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence as amended, please show by raising your hands. Opposed. The motion is carried.

MR. J. BUCHANAN (Organization Committee Chairperson): Resolution O-11 deals with the imposition of a first agreement on Graham Cable and T.V.

Your Committee had a problem with such a resolution emanating from a local union and the implications thereof. However, recognizing the extreme difficulty unions have in achieving a fair agreement in the given circumstances, your Committee is amending the resolution to read as follows:

"WHEREAS members of the Communications and Electrical Workers of Canada, Local 55, have been on strike against Graham Cable and TV for more than six months in an effort to obtain a first collective agreement; and

"WHEREAS the employer has been convicted of unfair labour practices under the provisions of the Canada Labour Code; and

"WHEREAS CWC Local 55 has applied to the Minister of Labour for assistance in resolving this dispute;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress request the federal government to review its file on the Graham Cable and TV case with a view to applying the terms of the present legislation; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC in its next submission to government seek to strengthen and improve the legislation dealing with the imposition of a first agreement recognizing the realities of the electronic age."

Your Committee therefore recommends concurrence in resolution O-11, as amended. I so move; seconded by R. Bezo.

MR. V. MORTEN (CWC): Our local put forward this resolution because the only way that we could help these workers to obtain the right to have a union was to get the Canadian Labour Congress to bring pressure to bear on the government to that end. They have been on strike for some seven months now, fighting just to have the right to have a union.

That employer does not want a union in there and has clearly stated it. I do not believe there is any other way that they will have a union and have the right to a first contract unless we get behind them.

We have to go to the federal government, we have to ask them to impose the first contract legislation so these people will have the right to union and be able to go back in to work and struggle to build and develop some of the things that we enjoy in the trade union movement in our jobs.

MR. G. CWITCO (CWC): I want to share with you some of the problems that this small group of workers have in an industry that is primarily unorganized in this country.

Graham Cable is a television cable company in the west end of the city of Toronto and three times they have been convicted before the Canada Labour Relations Board of unfair labour practices. First, they attempted to reduce the wages of some of the sales personnel and when the sales personnel refused to accept their reduction in wages, they fired them. They went to the Canada Labour Relations Board on "unjustified dismissal" and were reinstated. That case was the motivation for an organizing drive and we signed that group up almost 100 per cent. We were certified and we began bargaining. The lawyer who is bargaining for the company is a famous lawyer in Ontario. Some of you may not know him, his name is McKellock. Those of you who may know him by reputation because you may have heard of Radio Shack and he was responsible for much of the activities in Radio Shack in terms of their bargaining strategy and he is using that same bargaining strategy at Graham Cable.

At Graham Cable, the workers started a legal work-to-rule campaign and the manager of that company, who got his training in Atlanta, Georgia, asked all the workers after the work-to-rule campaign began, to sign a "yellow dog" contract. That said every one of them would carry out their full job functions and not engage in a legal work-to-rule campaign. And those who refused to sign were not allowed into the building. They were locked out illegally and we went to the Labour Relations Board and we won the case.

The activities of the employer were ruled illegal, but by that time the employers' objective had been achieved: they had split the union. They had scared and frightened many of the members into the fear that if they continued to take legal union activities, in an attempt to gain their rights, they would lose their jobs. Our union was split: 35 people started to strike that day as a result of that lockout and they have been on strike now for ten months.

After six months on strike, the employer promoted a decertification application among the scabs and the decertification application was rejected by the Board. On the very day that the decertification application was rejected by the Board, there was an application for certification by a company association. This is a strike for the right to have a union and in the federal jurisdiction

we have something that is called first contract legislation. We want your support in demanding that the Minister acts because, if ever there was a case of an employer that simply did not want a union, this is that case. Those 35 workers who have been on strike need your support. They have earned your support by hard winter months and long winter months on the picket line, please give it to them.

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW, Canada): I think the matter of first contract legislation is extremely important to this labour movement. If you look at what happened at the Bank of Commerce, you look at what is happening in a number of other situations, the facts are that: legislation in most provinces and nationally, except in some circumstances, gives workers a right to join a union. But when workers join the union, they do not join the union just to become members of the organization, they join because they want a collective agreement that will give them some improvements in wages, benefits and working conditions. Before we had union security in Ontario, the employers who did not want to have a collective agreement would put the matter of union security on the table and say we will not give you a check-off and they know that without a check-off the union could not survive in the plant and so we campaigned until we got compulsory union check-off and now the employers have taken an entirely different tactic, such as the Bank of Commerce, which I think are some of the worst people in collective bargaining that I have ever seen in this country.

They come to the bargaining table and they force the bargaining process, but the legislation does not allow the trade union involved to apply for automatic first contract arbitration. The workers have to go on strike and look at what happened in the Bank of Commerce. A group of people, mostly women, a lot of minority groups, a lot of single parents, had to go on strike for eight months before we could move the government to take this matter before the Canada Labour Relations Board and after 16 days of evidence by members of our staff and CLC staff and the workers, the Labour Relations Board came down and condemned the Bank of Commerce for everything that they had done at the bargaining table and then implemented a first contract; but only for one year. We then went back to the bargaining table and the Bank of Commerce would not even put on the bargaining table the matters which the Canada Labour Board had said should be settled in the first agreement.

We met with Shirley Carr and the CLC and we worked out a strategy in which we said we will zero in on the Bank of Commerce and, as far as we are concerned we will apply for first contract arbitration before a strike. What we have to campaign for is not the Minister having the right to turn this over to the Canada Labour Relations Board, we have to campaign for having access to first contract arbitration without having to strike for eight months on the picket line. It should not be a one-year agreement, it should be at least a two-year agreement. I say to the delegates here that if this labour movement wants to move, and we must move in the areas of the service industry like the banks and places like Eaton's and others, we have to have something that tells those workers if you belong to our organizations we will get you a collective agreement because if we do not have that, the employers are very smart.

There are hundreds and thousands of people in the Bank of Commerce that want to join the Canadian Union of Bank Employees, but they do not want to participate in an eight-month strike to do that and we all understand that, so we have to get the legislation changed and say we have access and we organize those workers, we will guarantee you that we will get you a collective agreement either by collective bargaining or by the legislative process and if we do that, my guess is, the banks will come to the bargaining table.

MS. K. McGOVERN (CUPE): Some of the delegates may be asking themselves for a couple dozen workers why are they bringing in the big guns?

Graham Cable is located in the city of York, Graham Cable is owned by David Graham, David Graham is married to Barbara Amiel, need we say more?

MR. C. ROSNER (ITU): On the question of first contract legislation, I just want to make a few points. The speaker we just heard was saying essentially some very dangerous things. He was saying that we can rely on the government to ensure that workers, in a newly organized bargaining unit, get a contract. He mentioned the case of Eaton's so I think it is important to look at the case for a minute.

I come from Manitoba where we have first contract legislation. What happened in the Eaton's case in Brandon, Manitoba? The workers getting organized there were told by the leaders of the union not to worry, we will not have to go on strike, we will just apply to the Labour Board, get a first contract, everything will be fine; so that was what was done. The Labour Board imposed a contract and Eaton's management decides simply to ignore it. They used all the same tactics that they used in other situations. They threatened the workers to shut down completely; that they would lay everybody off because they would not accept the terms of this first contract, they influenced the workers into accepting the term and conditions that the company wanted. The government of Manitoba did not come to the assistance of these employees. Because they had been told that they did not have to fight, that they did not have to go on strike to get a contract, that they could simply rely on the governments to win their battle for them, once Eaton's management refused to accept the terms of the first contract, the fight was over and what happened in the end was that Eaton's management succeeded. They successfully influenced the employees into a lousy contract, into a wage freeze and even worse in many of the provisions of that contract.

I think it is very dangerous to tell workers that we can guarantee you a contract.

How can you guarantee something in this world without fighting for it? How can you go to the same governments which curtail and restrict the rights of the workers all across Canada and say to your members, let us depend on this government to guarantee us a contract? Yes, they may guarantee you a contract but it may be the worst possible contract in the world, it may be better to have no contract at all.

MR. D. GALVIN (CUPE): We have before us another resolution which indicates the disdain management, municipal, provincial and federal governments have for working people, union, non-union.

To me, the House of Labour is a symbol of all working people, a place where we can come and clean ourselves of the filth propagated by our employers and governments, a place where we can come and generate energy within ourselves, so as to go back to the battlements or our workplace to fight for better conditions and benefits, etc. It is a place where we can debate issues but the end result being we will not leave divided, for we are one, a whole, a chain linked, where an injury to one is an injury to all, where an injustice to one is an injustice to all.

When we discuss the fight for self-preservation, the fight is for our sons and daughters, the fight for our Canadian heritage, our Canada. The House of Labour will show all Canadians what leadership is all about. Leadership is not destruction but resurrection of a country for the benefit of all working Canadians and we have that power, strength and fight here within the House of Labour because the House of Labour has the spirit of honesty, integrity and the spirit of justice for all Canadians. Management and governments have one purpose, and that is to break the unions, to discourage, demoralize, humiliate unions. So, I will say, ask not what the union can do for you but what you can do for your union, ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country and that is get rid of the Conservative government.

MR. W. HUDSON (President, MFL): First, I would like to

thank the labour movement across Canada for supporting the NDP's re-election in Manitoba, the first government of this country that got in first contract legislation that could be imposed at the request of the union without proving unfair bargaining practice on the part of the employer. It is simply a situation where a union has a problem, after organizing with a group of employees, does not have its base ship in place; does not have the bargaining strength with small or large groups of people, does have the right to apply for the Labour Board of Manitoba and both sides are allowed to put in their arguments. The Labour Board will them impose a contract.

Fortunately in Manitoba, with the Eaton situation, they were able to get a contract without going through a five or six-month bitter strike. It is true that the employer forced them to roll back some of the provisions that had been imposed. That was done in order to save their bargaining unit.

Our problem in Manitoba is not the government of Manitoba. The government of Manitoba is taking this first contract legislation in order to protect the right to have first contracts. The right to have the first contract imposed, compulsory membership, the payment of dues, ongoing consultation and fairness, are being taken to the Supreme Court of Canada. Our problem in Manitoba is not the government of Manitoba but the courts that intervene. The employers have intervened and have taken us to court. We are now facing tens of thousands of dollars of legal bills, in order to save the first contract legislation. This legislation has worked. There were a lot of pessimists who said at the outset you have a contract for one year and then you will lose in anyway. That has not been the case, there are now some 20 odd first contracts in place that have been imposed by the Labour Board and there have been at least 10 renegotiated; it is working.

We are supportive of it in Manitoba, the Federation of Labour fought for it, we will continue to fight for it. We want it and we will keep it.

MR. W. CLARK (TWU): In the early 1970s, we had this debate when the NDP government was in for three years and gave us the first contract legislation. We have had a cablevision strike going in British Columbia now for seven or eight months. It is not a question of the government interfering or the government doing the bargaining, it is the government guaranteeing that, when a small group of people join a union, they have a right to get a collective agreement first, and start working. There is no way that groups of workers, 15 or 20 or 25, can go on strike every six months against multi-national corporations that have the very same size groups of employees all over North America. It is not a philosophical or a theoretical problem, it is a real problem. If a small group of workers organize and cannot get a first agreement, against the big corporations or multinational corporations, there has to be legislation in place.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence, Resolution 0-11 as amended, please show you hands. Opposed? The motion is carried. Thank you very much and my thanks to the Committee.

I would ask the Committee on General Resolutions to come forward and I will also ask the Committee on Social Action and Services to come up to the podium.

May Day — South Africa

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): While the Committee is coming up, we have a message from COSATU regarding the May Day celebration. You will recall our brothers had to leave early. Approximately 150,000 people attended COSATU rallies across South Africa. Several rallies were banned by the police. Three trade union officials were detained in the Western Cape. About one and a half million workers stayed away from work following the COSATU and CUSA call for a work stoppage to observe May Day.

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson): We will attempt to get some work done here on some of the important resolutions. We have an Emergency Resolution on Property Rights, which we will deal with first.

MR. T. WHITTHAMES (General Resolutions Committee Secretary): The Property Rights Resolution was submitted to us by the Executive Council of the CLC.

> "WHEREAS the most powerful sectors in our society, the corporations and those with extensive business holdings, favour entrenchment of property rights in the Constitution; and
>
> "WHEREAS property rights include control of natural resources and business properties such as the employer's contracts with employees or a doctor's contract with patients; and
>
> "WHEREAS the entrenchment of property rights would favour private interests over the public interest in control over natural resources, medicare and progressive labour legislation; would favour corporate power and the wealthy over those who are less well off; and would make it more difficult for a progressive government to redistribute and equalize income and services in our society;
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC oppose the entrenchment of property rights;
>
> "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC develop an information program to inform working people across Canada about the issues and implications of entrenched property rights."

I so move and it is seconded by R. White, Committee Chairperson.

MR. D. MARTIN (Executive Vice-President, CLC): Property may seem initially to be a rather boring subject; but it is similar to the lack of discussion that we had as a country and certainly as a labour movement when the Charter of Rights was being designed and put together.

Property rights, in fact, will lead to fundamental changes in our whole social, political, cultural structure. For example, in the United States, property rights have been enshrined in the Constitution right from the time that the Constitution was declared. Throughout the early 1900s the Chamber of Commerce, the American Manufacturers' Association and other big business used the property rights clause in the American Constitution to prohibit or, in fact, nullify items such as the minimum wage, labour legislation, child rights, child labour laws that had been proclaimed by state legislatures and the Congress.

In the 1930s, Roosevelt who was one of the most progressive presidents in the United States, went to the Supreme Court and said; "you better start rectifying the situation or I will start rectifying you." Consequently, they did get some substantial changes by the United States Supreme Court as it affected property rights.

There is a big move to enshrine property rights in our Charter of Rights. Many of the provinces, certainly the Bennett government in British Columbia, are pushing property rights to be enshrined in the Constitution and, of course, the Bennett government and other governments of a similar nature are nothing but the political action committee of the Business Council on National Issues and the Chamber of Commerce, so of course they do their bidding. What they are in fact going to try to do is bring property rights that would nullify all the things that we have been talking about. For example, if we ever brought in pay equity the way we want it in terms of the legislation, that would probably be declared *ultra vires* simply because it would affect the contract rights that our employers have, it would affect their property rights. Medicare, as the resolution reads, would be affected and be detrimental in terms of property rights.

All the other things that we have been proposing, especially the economic issues, would be affected. For example, when Tommy Douglas and the Saskatchewan government were nationalizing the potash industry to use it as an economic tool for the benefit of Saskatchewan and for the benefit of all Canadians, the issue of nationalization of the potash industry, or for that matter any other national resource industries, would be affected and you could not do it. Property rights does not have anything to do with your owning your own home, your farm or anything like that.

Property rights has everything to do with the big business groups that want to enshrine it in the Constitution and in the Charter of Rights, to ensure that we could not bring in progressive legislation; in fact, it would bring us to a standstill and bring us way back into the 1920s and 1900s.

Consequently, we have to be on our guard because there is a big move afoot to bring property rights in. In fact, there is a number of members of the Cabinet, of this Conservative government, that have said that they want to enshrine property rights in the Constitution and we will have to raise the flag just as we have raised the flag in the past, in terms of bringing it to the country's attention and to all of our brothers and sisters in the labour movement that it is a bad thing to have and we have to fight against it and put our position forward very strongly. It is bad news and we have to fight it.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): There are no other speakers. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence on this Resolution No. 1, hands up. Opposed. The motion is carried.

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson): Delegates, we will move to Resolution G-55 on which the Committee recommends concurrence. We also received an Emergency Resolution from CUPE dealing with the matter of cutbacks of CBC so we have tied in an amendment.

MR. T. WITTHAMES (General Resolutions Committee Secretary): Resolution G-55 as amended:

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress advise the government that Canadian workers will not accept the bartering of hard-won legislation and long established measures critical to the survival of Canadian culture, for the commercial gain of American multinational and corporate interests. The Congress demands that the government remove the cultural industries and cultural and social policies from the bargaining table; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Canada immediately initiate measures to strengthen Canadian production in broadcasting, film, theatre, publishing, the visual arts and other areas of Canadian endeavour. Such measures must include increases in the budget of the CBC, the Canada Council, Telefilm Canada, museums and other cultural agencies; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that programs initiated with the intent to strengthen Canadian artistic production be developed, supervised and assessed by boards and bodies comprised of representatives of the industry rather than political appointees;

"THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that, as the report of the task force on broadcasting is expected within the new few weeks, the Canadian Labour Congress petitions the federal government to require the management of the CBC to cancel any proposed cuts."

I so move and it is seconded by the Committee.

MR. G. JOHNSON (CUPE): I thank the Committee for their recommendation. I would urge everyone to support this resolution. We have had a lot of difficulties, we are still suffering from the effects of budget cuts.

We have heard a lot of resolutions this week about cutbacks and layoffs. We too are trying to keep the CBC as a cultural entity. We also are trying to keep the jobs and every time we turn around it is another person's job, another person's life and the big task that we in labour have to do is to try to keep the battle on the forefront and keep the public's perspective focused right on the government.

So we certainly appreciate all your efforts in filling out our cut-back card, supporting us in this struggle and thank you very much for your assistance in this resolution.

MR. L. CARTER (CUPE): I would like to ask all of you to take a look at the broadcasting that is available in your homes.

Primarily what you see on television is American. American television is supported by commercial interests. The CBC is financed primarily by you. You are able to have some cultural identity expressed through your television networks. I would like you all to support this resolution.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): No other speakers. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation G-55, concurrence as amended, please show your hands. Opposed. The recommendation is adopted.

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson) We will now deal with Resolution G-30.

MR. T. WHITTHAMES (General Resolutions Committee Secretary): G-30 as amended:

"WHEREAS the South African policy of apartheid is repugnant to all those who detest racial discrimination and segregation; and

"WHEREAS the South African regime employs brutal and oppressive measures against opponents of apartheid; and

"WHEREAS several Canadian provinces have agreed not to import any more South African alcoholic products;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress step up its boycott of all goods and merchandise exported to Canada by South Africa, and that such boycott be promoted both within the ranks of the CLC and in the public realm; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress encourage Federations of Labour to lobby all provincial and territorial governments to withdraw all South African products from liquor outlets until such time as the policy of apartheid in South Africa is abolished."

I so move and it is seconded by R. White, Committee Chairperson.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I see no speakers. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please show. Opposed. The motion is carried.

MR. T. WHITTHAMES (General Resolutions Committee Secretary): Resolution G-59 as amended:

"WHEREAS a growing portion of the budget of Canada ($10.3 billion in 1984) is earmarked for military expenditures, to the detriment of urgent social needs; and

"WHEREAS, increasingly, the very existence of our planet is threatened by the nuclear arms race; and

"WHEREAS the Canadian labour movement has always been in the vanguard of progressive social measures; and

"WHEREAS our unions have always fought to promote justice and equity for workers and the different peoples of the world; and

"WHEREAS a growing number of our members attach a great deal of importance to the question of disarmament and peace in the world;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress designate a person to co-ordinate awareness and mobilization programs on peace and disarmament."

I so move and it is seconded by R. White, Committee Chairperson.

Mr. G. OGDEN (UFAWU): I wonder if I could ask for a bit of clarification from the Committee. What did they have in mind in terms of designating? Was it intended to be a secondary duty to one of the people working there already or would it be somebody who could devote full time?

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson): Well, obviously we think the role of he labour movement increasingly being active in the peace movement would take somebody almost full time, but if you look at the Constitution of the Canadian Labour Congress, the only person to make that determination is the President and I think, if we adopt this resolution at the Convention, it is fairly clear what we think should be done here.

MR. B. OGDEN (UFAWU): This is an excellent resolution and we should give it all our wholehearted support because of the fact that the war danger has been growing steadily over the past number of years, also the peace forces grow in proportion and, therefore, this resolution really reflects what is actually happening in the minds of people of Canada and of around the world.

I believe that it is very important and I would certainly like to see this program go into effect. There is a number of things happening in terms of international affairs that need to be pointed out in a more strong and meaningful way.

For instance, the question of conversion. There are problems in diverting money from the huge arms budget towards social programs and programs which are needed, i.e. coast guard, shipping industry, shipbuilding, housing etc. Some of our brothers and sisters are afraid that if some of the war programs are shut down, it will mean more and more people into the ranks of the unemployed and that is not so.

Those are the kinds of programs that a full time co-ordinator should be able to zero in on, so that it will alleviate some of the fear that is building up among some of the members in the trade union movement. There is a lot of people in Canada that do not realize yet that the danger that we are facing is coming mainly from the United States in, trying to convert space into a battleground.

Gorbachev has proposed to the United Nations and to the United States the elimination of all nuclear weapons by the turn of the century. A lot of people have not realized it yet; but this program, when put into effect, will certainly go a long way towards helping that process.

MS. M. NEWMAN (PSAC-UNDE): Sister Carr, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to finally be able to come to a pro mike, representing the Department of National Defence employees and be able to speak on this subject. There has been amongst delegates a great deal of misunderstanding on the position of our union and our members on the peace and disarmament situation. The real problem is that it has been a misunderstanding and that we have not listened to one another as maybe we should.

This resolution will eliminate that problem because, under the Canadian Labour Congress, which is very vocal in its quest for peace as well as unity, our concerns will be addressed. I just want to assure the delegates to this Convention that our members do want peace, they certainly are not warmongers. However, we have a side to our story and I believe that this resolution, if it is accepted, will provide the opportunity for our union to give our side of the story and the Congress in its wisdom will make sure that there is unity in the union movement even on a topic this controversial.

MR. W. BROWN (CUPE): I am very pleased to support this resolution because another resolution, that has not been debated on this floor, talked about educating our school children to the disastrous and terrible effects of nuclear war.

After President Reagan attacked Libya with his jets, a high school in Burlington did a survey amongst 14 to 18 year olds and one of the questions on that survey was: "Did they support that action?" I am sorry to tell you that, not only did they support it, but over 60 per cent of those children in that high school said: "Let us nuke them." I believe that children generally reflect their parents and it saddens me that we have children of that age that would say that.

Not only do we have to educate the children, it is very obvious to me that we have to educate our brothers and sisters in the labour movement and our brothers and sisters outside the labour movement. It is very obvious that people are taking a very relaxed view to the fact of just how terrible nuclear war would be. In fact, I believe people are hiding their heads in the sand.

As long as we have people such as the Thatchers and the Reagans in this world, we certainly cannot look forward to a very special co-existence with anybody and so, therefore, we should support this 100 per cent. I think it is quite possible that local unions and federations of labour should also start this type of educational program and I believe we should start teaching these programs at our schools for our own members because it is obvious to me that if children of that age will give that kind of answer to a survey, it is a real tragedy.

Somewhere along the line, we have really missed out educating our children.

MR. G. WEISLEDER (NUPGE-OPSEU): This resolution simplifies the kind of commitment to action that many delegates were looking for in the general statement on foreign affairs.

Certainly the arms' race is a very, very serious threat, not only to our continued economic survival, because of the drain on jobs that arms' expenditure represents, but to the very survival of this planet. It should be very clear to us that the war danger also starts particularly from regional conflicts where the United States intervenes against national liberation movements and even assaults the sovereignty of countries that dare diverge from American foreign policy priorities. The people of Nicaragua have suffered some 14,000 casualties over the last four and a half years as a result of the U.S. contras' war of aggression against that country.

The attack on Libya, I think, exemplifies the extension of U.S. Central American policy; and it is critical that this co-ordinator work with organizations that are prepared to denounce that active aggression, to denounce the stands of our own Canadian government in being only one of four countries around the world to endorse the outrageous barbaric action of the Reagan administration in bombing Libya and attempting to put get other countries around the world to endorse the outrageous, barbaric action of the Reagan administration in bombing Libya and attempting to put rebel countries on notice that the U.S. will not accept any divergence from U.S. policy on the part of any regime around the world. It is also important for delegates to recognize that this affects our own rights here in this country, the rights of working people in other countries as well, because the "anti-terrorism campaign" being orchestrated by the Reagan administration has a direct impact on our civil liberties as well.

Just the other day, many of us heard on television a learned professor, speaking at a conference in Ottawa, theorize that several university campuses across the country are breeding grounds of terrorism. This kind of witch-hunt mentality, which is being utilized by the Reagan and Mulroney administrations and other governments, is designed to stop any opposition to U.S. aggression in Libya and Central America and elsewhere and this labour movement has to stand up in opposition to that.

Yes, opposition to the arms' race; yes opposition to the bombing of Libya, to the attack on the people of Nicaragua; and yes, opposition to this phoney anti-terrorism campaign which is supported by a pack of lies that emanate out of the White House on a

day-to-day basis. We should encourage the co-ordinator to work with organizations which are getting the truth about the reality of American arms policy, American foreign policies, Canadian government complicity with that policy and work with organizations that are organizing demonstrations like the ones that will occur in June in Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa and other countries against U.S. intervention in Central America.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I will now put the question, all those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of concurrence in Resolution G-59, as amended please show. Opposed. Carried.

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson): We will now deal with Resolutions G-18 and G-27. We have a composite resolution in document no. 5. The Secretary of the Committee will read it and then I will give a brief explanation of the reason for recommendation.

MR. T. WITTHAMES (General Resolutions Committee Secretary): The composite resolution.

"WHEREAS an agreement was signed by the CLC authorizing the 16th Constitutional Convention to be held in Toronto without a written understanding regarding the future unionization of employees of the facilities; and

"WHEREAS CLC Conventions should, as a matter of principle, be held in facilities where the employees of the facilities are unionized;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the CLC Executive will, as a matter of principle, obtain unionized facilities for its constitutional conventions."

I so move and it is seconded by a member of the Committee.

MR. R. WHITE (General Resolutions Committee Chairperson): I just want to explain some of the difficulties that the Executive has in terms of choosing a site for the Convention.

There are now really only four locations which will hold a Convention of this size and they are Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver.

In Montreal, most of the hotels are organized but the convention facility is only partly organized. In Toronto, part of the Convention Centre is organized. We have an application in for certification for l'Hôtel, which we hope will be successful. In Winnipeg, the Convention Centre is fully organized but many of the hotels are not. Now the Executive is contemplating going to Vancouver for the next convention. The facilities there, which are part of Expo, have not been completed. We hope that when they are completed and staffed, they will be organized. The difficulty that the Executive has to face is that we have to make that decision at least two or three years ahead of time and make a deposit at that location and that deposit is not refundable. These are some of the difficulties but we have tried to include in the resolution, the matter of principle which I think was the concern of the local unions that sent this to the Executive.

We are therefore recommending concurrence in this composite resolution.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I do not see anyone at the microphones. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation of this resolution. Opposed. The motion is carried and I would thank the Committee for the work that they have done.

The next Committee is the Committee on Social Action and Services.

SOCIAL ACTION AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

MR. A. KUBE (Social Action and Services Committee Chairperson): To make sure that there is a debate on the important question of medicare, we will slightly change the order of priority in document 13 and will proceed to the resolution dealing with medicare.

MS. S. WALLACE (Social Action and Services Committee Secretary): S-89, amended:

"BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress stand four-square behind the preservation and extension of universal health care as a basic social right of all Canadians; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC will actively campaign to ensure that:

1. All user fees, extra billing and any other tax on the sick be abolished;
2. There will be no privatization of health care in Canada in any form whatsoever;
3. Our health system recognizes the involvement of the community in the provision of health care to Canadians, including the creation and extension of community health clinics;
4. The funding of medicare through health care and medicare premiums be replaced through general tax revenue financing; and
5. The goals and work of the Canadian Health Coalition in ensuring that health care remains an accessible and universal social right of Canadians be continued; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC demand the federal government provide adequate funding to the provinces so that a truly universal non-discriminatory medicare system for all Canadians be achieved."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence, seconded by A. Kube.

MR. T. KOZAR (NUPGE-BCGEU): Medicare is a basic social right in Canada and we have determined that through the electoral process. I want to remind delegates that it was an act of national will in the 1960 election of the Pearson government, who went to the people of Canada with one plan in their election platform, and that was the implementation of the national medical scheme. That decision was a national democratic decision made by the people of Canada that mandated the government to fund a universal medical scheme through the national treasury. That mandate for the implementation of a national medical scheme was given by us and I believe can only be taken away by us. No political party seeking election since then has sought a mandate from the people to decrease or eliminate medicare. None would dare, as they know that the people of Canada would vote with avengeance to keep them out of office. The national medicare system is ours. We decided to implement it and the decision to change it is also ours, and not an executive decision that can be made by any government without facing the test of the question before the electorate of Canada.

The issue of extra billing is a further form of taxation by doctors who perform services under medicare. It is a ransom by the medical profession that they seek to impose on the sick and those who seek medical help. Quite frankly, I am tired of the moans of the medical profession who demand the right to have their own form of private taxation, through extra billing, to augment their income. They cry that they are entitled to more, because of the investment they have made in their education and training to become doctors. The hypocrisy of that position is incredible.

For every general practitioner that has graduated in Canada, the workers and the taxpayers of Canada have spent about $550,000 in taxes to support universities, teaching staff, training hospitals and other facilities to provide the vocational training programs for doctors. If anyone owes anything, it is the doctors and the medical profession who owe us. We paid for their training and we paid for their services and we are not paying any more through extra billing. I say that any government that allows extra billing should be thrown out along with the extra bill.

Doctors are one of the few trades that have someone pay for their tool box; and if you do not believe that then ask your own doctor how much he or she has put up to buy the scan or the X-ray equipment in your local hospital. The special interest group of doctor lobbies has no right to interfere with the system of universal medicare that the Canadian people put in place and have committed to finance through our taxes.

There is no cause to privatize health care in Canada. We can afford a public health care system; but we cannot afford to have the ring of the cow bell in the wards replaced by the right of a cash register at the door of the hospital. We owe it to our brothers and sisters, our sons and daughters, our fathers, our mothers, our neighbours, our friends, to defend as an inalienable right of the people of this country, unfettered, non-discriminatory access to a quality publicly funded universal medicare system in this country.

If the answer to this demand from the national and provincial governments is that they need more taxes to pay for medicare, then I say to them from the floor of this Convention that they better call on their corporate friends to pay the deferred taxes that they owe the Canadian people and, with that, they can pay their fair share of the freight instead of wrecking our medicare system. I urge all the delegates to understand the peril to which our medicare system is now subject and I urge your unanimous support for this resolution.

MR. A. JENKYN (UE): I want to address my remarks to this whole question of extra billing. As all the delegates from across the country know, there is a struggle going on in the province of Ontario at the present time based upon the accord that was reached between the NDP and the Liberal Party to bring in extra-billing legislation.

We have the disgraceful situation in Ontario at the present time where the Liberal party in Ontario is starting to backslide on this commitment and is starting to buckle under the pressure of the OMA to try to give the doctors some kind of a deal that they can live with and forget about the working people of this province.

They are trying to buy the doctors off with the taxpayers' money, and give them a back door way of still getting extra billing without directly charging the patient. In the process of doing this, the Ontario Medical Association is carrying on what I call the most blatant form of blackmail on the working people of this province and they are doing this under the guise of defending the medicare system, if you please, and on the freedom of doctors. The freedom of doctors is not being questioned. However, these are the type of slogans that they are using. The latest example of this type of blackmail was demonstrated yesterday in a report in *The Star* which supported Dr. Ian Munroe, head of the team that works on children who are deformed at the Hospital for Sick Children, who announced at a press conference at the Sick Children's Hospital that he, and the majority of his team, will be lifting up their roots in Canada and going to Dallas, Texas. One of the reasons that they are going is because of the deterioration of the health care system in Canada. This is the reason they say that they are going to Dallas. *The Star* revealed that Munroe and his team performed 1,000 operations in the Sick Children's Hospital on deformed children last year and they charged 100 per cent more than the Ontario medicare rates for every one of those operations. No wonder Doctor Munroe was concerned about what he calls the deterioration of medicare system!

If we enact extra-billing legislation in this province, he and the other specialists will not be able to charge the working people whose kids are deformed, the kind of charges they have imposed on them — 100 per cent.

I know what it means personally because I had a son who was burned in a car accident who had to have operations at the Sick Children's Hospital and I will tell you if I had to pay the extra billing that those doctors charged, if he had not been covered by the insurance company, I would be out with a pencil and a cup on Yonge Street today because I would not be able to afford to pay those extra charges. They charge thousands and thousands of dollars more than Ontario medicare pays for that kid's operations and I think this is criminal. Yes, for Doctor Munroe and doctors like him, the medicare system is deteriorating but it is not deteriorating for us.

We will fight to maintain it and to stop these people from extra-billing the working people of this province. I think there should be a requirement in the laws of this country that every doctor who takes the Hippocratic oath has to go back on an annual basis to his university and take the oath all over again because some of these people have forgotten what the Hippocratic oath is all about, mainly to service the people that they are responsible for and not bleed them.

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW, Canada): Ever since the Tommy Douglas government brought in medicare many years ago, we have had to face a challenge in this country from time to time, and we are now facing it again. We should never forget that the doctors are only part of the health care delivery system. There is a lot of other people involved as well and we also should never forget that, if we had let the doctors have their way, we should never had universal health care in this country.

You have the whole question of the federal government taking money away from the provinces on important health care funding. Then you have the continuing fight as to whether doctors should have the right to extra-bill or not; and that fight is now once again on in Ontario.

If the Ontario Medical Association is successful in moving the Peterson government back on this, this will be picked up and moved across the country again. If we do not think that the private insurance companies are in behind saying "go to it doctors and we will come in and pay for the extra billing with some private insurance money", then we do not know what this is all about. It is absolutely scandalous that the doctors have a right to use patients — and we know the special relationship between the patients and their doctors — to use the patients on the campaign to acquire the right to extra-bill.

Imagine nurses, who have to go to compulsory arbitration, coming into the hospital room the next morning and saying we would like to give you a needle that will cost you another $15, they cannot do that. There is nobody in the rest of the health care system that can do that.

And is it not interesting on the right to strike? This government of Ontario, just a few days ago, legislated public sector workers, wheel trends drivers, back to work with very short notice. The doctors are threatening to take all of the doctors off the job to strike and all we have heard from the Premier up to now is "We want to sit down and try and work this out;" and they are taking months of negotiations. What a double standard, in terms of how you want to treat people in society.

I appeared before the Select Committee of Ontario to give our union's position very clearly and some of the Tories said to me, "Mr. White, what you are talking about is socialized medicine." I said, "No kidding, I thought we had it. What you are trying to talk is privatized medicine." And they said: "Do you agree that doctors should have the right to strike?" I said, "under certain conditions. If you will give it to the doctors then you better make sure all the rest of the health care workers have it because we had trade union leaders go to jail in this province for the right to strike." This is one issue once again which this labour movement must help carry the fight. We have an excellent health care coalition going in Ontario and an excellent coalition going nationally. We cannot allow the doctors to continue to extra-bill the patients of this province.

Universal health care means that any worker, any family in this country, has the right to the best health care whether they are on welfare or whether they are millionaires. That is a fundamental principle that we must stand for. They are carrying on a

campaign. I have received more letters in my office from doctors, or their wives, saying to me "why do you not keep your nose out of this and deal with the UAW problems, we do not stick our nose in yours."

When I was involved in this in 1970, I received a little important message from one of the doctors' wives. I made a speech on the Sunday. A phone call came to my secretary on Monday and this woman said: "Is this Mr. White's office?", and she said: "Yes, it is". "Just tell him I am doctor so and so's wife, I hope his penis falls off and he cannot get a doctor to sew him back on again!" So I walked around looking over my shoulder for about five days and then said: "Okay, we have to keep the fight going anyway." In the small communities across Ontario, they are carrying on a vicious campaign of fear against what will happen if the doctors are not allowed to extra-bill. They have used the worse rhetoric in this process; and we have to, as a labour movement, work with the coalitions to keep this health care universal.

MR. C. PILKEY (President, OFL): The doctors, while attempting to keep extra-billing, will deny the quality of services for the less fortunate in our society, the old people, the retirees, the handicapped and others, that cannot afford extra-billing.

The doctors in Ontario are saying unequivocally: "It is not a matter of money, it is a principle." Most of us recall what Tommy Douglas said about that, he said: "When anybody tells you it is not money, it is the principle, let me tell you, it is the money." I happen to believe that is true in this case.

One of the roots of the problem is transfer payments to the provincial governments. In Ontario the federal government is saying: "if you continue with extra-billing then we will cut back on the funding" and that makes some sense. There are other areas in the whole field of social services that the federal government is cutting back on social services, cutting back on transfer payments and what does that mean? That means that either there is a shift in the cost to the provinces and the municipalities or it's a cutback in services to the people of the provinces of this nation and we should oppose that vehemently, because that means laying off workers in the public sector, that means a denial of services to the people of this country.

We have fought long and hard for decent legislation, we have fought hard through the collective bargaining process for decent social services, and I think we should continue that.

Bob asked whether doctors should have the right to strike. Let me tell you what my position was. I think that doctors should have a right to strike the same as everybody else but on the flip side of the coin. When they negotiate an OMA schedule of fees, then that should be their fee. They should not be different than workers who negotiate a collective bargaining agreement, when they have to accept that as their wage level. In other words, if it is good enough for the workers, it is good enough for the doctors of this country.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question is being called, concurrence in Resolution S-89 as amended, all those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please show your hands. Opposed. The motion is carried unanimously.

MR. A. KUBE (Social Action and Services Committee Chairperson): The Committee is recommending concurrence in a composite resolution to cover resolutions S-42, S-53, S-92, S-93, S-103, S-126 and S-127.

MR. W. JEWERS (Social Action and Services Committee Member):

"WHEREAS inflation undermines the purchasing power of pensions that are not indexed to changes in the cost of living (60 per cent of the purchasing power of non-indexed pensions has been lost over the past ten years); and

"WHEREAS inflation normally results in high returns on investment and pension fund surpluses; and

"WHEREAS employers are under no legal obligation to use these surpluses to improve benefits and in most Canadian jurisdictions they can actually take pension surpluses back into corporate treasuries; and

"WHEREAS the practice of removing pension fund surpluses has been increasing and now amounts to at least $200 million per year; and

"WHEREAS the practice of removing pension fund surpluses highlights the need to include plan members in the management of pension plans and to provide plan members with full financial information on the operation of their pension plan;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress and the provincial federations of labour work together to ensure that pension benefits' legislation throughout Canada bans the removal of pension fund surpluses by employers; and requires that improvements be made to the pensions of retirees to the extent that the contribution on behalf of the retirees account for the surplus; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that pension benefits' legislation require joint management of pension plans by employers and plan members where it is requested by the plan members and that all plan members and their collective bargaining agents have access to all relevant information on the operation of their plans; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, whether or not these legislative requirements are implemented, that negotiating protection against inflation for retirees become a major priority in collective bargaining on pensions; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC and its affiliates defend the full indexing of pension benefits where it now exists."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence, seconded by A. Kube.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Anyone on the question? I see no one. All in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please show. Hands down. Opposed. Carried.

I would ask the Committee to step down and the Transportation and Maritime Committee to come forward.

Would the Occupational Health and Safety Committee come forward.

MR. N. VESSEY (PSAC-Agriculture Union): On a point of personal privilege. I have some concern in connection with this free trade map that was published because I have been here at the Convention and P.E.I. has disappeared so I am just wondering if there is some direction where I can go back to?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): I was going to ask you, all of the brothers and sisters from Prince Edward Island, if you had sunk into the water overnight and also I would like to know where Newfoundland is and how come you decided to go away from Canada.

MR. R. WHITE (President, UAW, Canada): This morning, it was reported on one of the television stations that the government has prepared a free trade package for all of the Members of Parliament. It cost them $70,000 for each package and the map of Canada does not have P.E.I. in it at all and has Newfoundland attached to the United States and I think that is a start on how free trade organizations will work out.

TRANSPORTATION AND MARITIME COMMITTEE

MR. J. HUNTER (Transportation and Maritime Committee Chairperson): We will be reporting on rail transport and Resolution TM-28 is on top of page 170 of your Resolutions Book:

"WHEREAS an internal assessment is being conducted by CN Rail of its major repair facilities in Moncton, Montreal

and Winnipeg, because of concerns of excessive capacity in its maintenance facilities; and

"WHEREAS New Brunswick municipalities, employers, citizens and local railway union leaders have all expressed concern about the effect layoffs, or even closure of Moncton main shops, would have on New Brunswick's economy, and more so on the Moncton area; and

"WHEREAS 4,000 employees of CN Rail are based in Moncton with 1,153 workers employed at the Moncton main shops;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress oppose any reduction in the workforce at CN Rail's Moncton shops; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC immediately communicate to the federal Minister of Transport and CN Board of Directors expressing its position and the importance of the main shops to the Moncton area."

I so move; seconded by T. Saunders.

MR. G. CALLENDAR (IAM): I would like to give a brief outline of the situation so you perhaps better understand our situation.

Canadian National Railways has three main shops located in Winnipeg, Montreal and Moncton and traditionally workload has been divided on the formula of 40/40/20, i.e. a per cent formula with Moncton receiving the 20 per cent portion of that workload which they are entitled to, being the smaller shop.

Approximately two years ago, it became evident that CN was not prepared to live with that formula any longer and indeed our fears for the future were confirmed on May 3, 1985, when Canadian National informed the rail unions in Moncton that, yes, indeed they were doing an assessment of their main shop facilities with the implied implication that the Moncton shop would close.

Shortly thereafter, with the help of the local and members of Parliament, the SOS Committee was formed. It is short for Save our Shops Committee; and this committee encompasses all local members of the Legislative Assembly, local MPs as well as business representatives and labour.

We have a committee that is united in the goal of saving our shops. The SOS Committee has staged rallies. We have met with the CN Board of Directors, and met with the Premier and the Cabinet on several occasions, we have met with the provincial opposition, we have met with the Minister of Transport, Mr. Mazankowski, we have lobbied all political parties in Ottawa, we have presented briefs to anyone who would listen and our members have sent over approximately 1,000 individual personal letters to the Prime Minister. This is out of 1,150 people that were working in the shop at that time and that is about a 90 per cent participation.

That shows the concern that our people have. We have also sent hundreds of petitions to the House of Commons and we have also sent approximately 70,000 cards to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Mazankowski, on the subject. But today all of that work appears to have a cumulated effect of water rolling off a duck's back.

The reason for this political action is that, should those shops close, it will be due to blatant political action on the part of the government. While the federal government allows one of its Crown corporations, the Canadian National Railway, to put 1,200 CN shop staff workers out of work, it has spent hundreds of millions of dollars to build maintenance facilities elsewhere in the past two years. Does that make sense? You have one Crown corporation that has excess plant capacity and yet they are putting out hundreds of millions of dollars to build new ones. We have a perfectly good facility in Moncton and God knows we need the work.

The Moncton shop is the single largest industrial employer in the province of New Brunswick and the consulting firm used by the SOS Committee estimates that, should those shops close, it would add another 4.6 per cent to the unemployment rate in southeastern New Brunswick.

Just for comparison purposes, if you took that 4.6 per cent and applied it to a major Metropolitan city such as Toronto, that would result in approximately 75,000 people losing their jobs due to political action. Could you imagine the outcry that that would cause? It is not different for a smaller city like Moncton. The effect is just as drastic as it would be for any major city such as Toronto.

If the federal government can close down a single largest industrial establishment in the province of New Brunswick, without any opposition from the rest of Canada, who is next!

MR. G. BOUDREAU (CBRT & GW): I think this is a terribly important issue to the people in the Maritimes, specifically in the Moncton, New Brunswick, area. There has been a tremendous amount of work done by people in the community and it comes from all segments of the community. What is happening with the CN shop, or at least the discussions on it, is just part of a master plan by the Canadian National Railway, previously supported by the last federal government and now pushed as hard as possible by the current government in Ottawa.

The shops, as we see it, will go unless something is done and it has to be done by the federal government. The Canadian Labour Congress has the national power and authority to do everything in its power to stop that from happening. We are beginning to feel like Third World countries down in the Maritimes because it seems, while we talk about privatization, we talk about free trade and the effect it may have on jobs in Ottawa, Quebec and the like, we are now beginning to suffer in the Maritimes. What in fact will happen, if the shops are closed in Moncton, will in effect create jobs in other parts of the country, mainly in Central Canada and we have no problems with that. We encourage jobs in Central Canada but not at the expense of the people in the Maritimes. The closure of the CN shop will have a devastating effect on the city of Moncton, the province of New Brunswick and the rest of the Maritime region. CN is now on a five-year course to totally, as I see it, separate its responsibility from the Maritime region. They are working with the present provincial government to pull up the tracks in Newfoundland. If they achieve that, then it will be the Cape Breton area and I suspect that, over the five-year period, they are talking about a 25 per cent reduction in their work force. We need not be master mathematicians to figure what that means. It appears to me that, five years down the road, CN will cease to become a national transportation system, as we have come to know it, and as it was established originally. We simply cannot allow that to happen. The CN shops shutdown is part of a plan to totally pull out of the Maritime region. So I urge the delegates, especially from the Maritime region, to be cognizant of what is going on because it will have a very devastating effect on the region as a whole.

MR. P. LAWRENCE (UTU): One question of the Committee before I speak. In document no. 15, you have put the resolution 38 and 42 but yet you mentioned only 28 here. Is it right to assume that the 38 and 42 are included?

MR. J. HUNTER (Transportation and Maritime Committee Chairperson): That is correct.

MR. P. LAWRENCE (UTU): I would like to suggest that the whole area of transportation in this country is under attack and, like the President of the CLC mentioned, it is the backbone of the country. I am rather disappointed that the document no. 15 did not come out with some sort of a policy statement in relation to transportation to help guide all the delegates and to co-ordinate the whole question of transportation because it is affecting air, sea, land and rail.

The Canadian National has a responsibility to provide service first for Canadians, profits second, or even third. Donald Gordon, when he was the President of the Canadian National Railway in 1947, said, when there was 150,000 workers on the CN at that time, that by a certain date he wanted to have that number multiply. As far as I know they achieved that and now they are cutting off the half of the half, if you will. One of the ways they are doing this is decentralization, not just in the car shops which we are addressing in Resolution 28, but in many other areas too. We have to look at this question, bearing in mind the whole question of decentralization, of deregulation, free trade and privatization. It is all part of the same plan, the overall plan, to divest themselves of those parts of the service which are not making huge profits and to just hang on to the juicy parts and here we are running into a situation where the corporate responsibility is certainly not towards the area in which they are operating, they are not thinking of those people that they will be putting out of work by decentralization.

They are not thinking of the communities that these people live in and the contribution that they have made and I think this is disgusting. I think it is absolutely disgusting because this is our railway, the Canadian National. It does not belong to some corporate body in New York or London. This is Canadian and I think it forces us to get up and scream from the highest mountain and tell this government of our that they better get back to service first and profits afterwards.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): There are no other speakers. The Committee's recommendation of concurrence with Resolution TM-28 to cover Resolutions TM-38 and TM-42. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please raise your hands. Opposed. Carried.

MR. J. HUNTER (Transportation and Maritime Committee Chairperson): Brothers and sisters the next resolution that we will deal with is TM-40. It deals with the increasing accidents and the railways that have developed particularly in this year.

> "WHEREAS there has been a series of serious and at times deadly railway accidents; and
>
> "WHEREAS there are to be several studies implemented by the federal government; and
>
> "WHEREAS the railways have been and are changing maintenance requirements on roadway and rolling stock equipment; and
>
> "WHEREAS these railways not only carry passengers, but also some of the most dangerous commodities in the world has to offer; and
>
> "WHEREAS these commodities are hauled through populated areas;
>
> "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress petition the federal government to have a full and open public inquiry into rail transportation safety in Canada; and
>
> "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that labour take an active role in these hearings to ensure our views are represented."

On behalf of the Committee, I move concurrence; seconded by T. Saunders.

MR. A. CIRELLI (CBRT & GW): Rail safety is one of the most important aspects of transportation. Why are we calling for a public inquiry? Needless to say that it is because of the situations that occurred at Mississauga; and the head-on collision in Hinton, Alberta, where both passengers and crew members got killed.

It is those types of accidents and disasters that could create a real problem in this country, particularly now that we are transporting more dangerous commodities than ever. There is an increase in that type of transportation that people are not aware of yet in this country. It takes a disaster like Mississauga to remind us what real safety means.

Deregulation in the transportation field will mean that companies like the railways will self-control their own safety and inspect the same. A public inquiry will allow us to have public input and when we say that the public needs to be involved in these kinds of inquiries, we mean that the Labour Congress and the federations and the labour councils are particularly called upon to put their best foot forward so that all aspects of safety are covered.

Self-inspection or self-regulation means that, over the years, the companies have been allowed, through their lobbying of governments, to self-control and manage the waste disposal of hazardous commodities. What has happened? We have thousands of burial sites that are perking up every once in a while and spilling their venom into our underground water and to our surfaces. So those kinds of situations call for an inquiry. When we start transporting them from one part of the country to another, without the proper safety regulation in place, then we are looking for a disaster and we do not need that.

I want to suggest to this body and the Canadian Labour Congress that, not only rail safety be a major part of our campaign, when we talk about deregulation, but all modes of transportation, so that Canada can be proud of its transportation system in transporting services, people and goods from one end of the country to the other.

MR B. HENRY (UTU): This resolution is very timely with the recent tragedy at Hinton where brothers of mine in the UTU were involved in a terrible accident, the cause of which may never be found out.

Brother Cirelli talked about dangerous commodities. Let me tall you about the pressure and the stress that is on our people right in these trains. We are there in the engines and in the caboose, to do more than wave at people; that is the nice part of the job. We are sitting there watching trains going down the tracks at 60 miles an hour, that weigh 15,000 tons. We are carrying every conceivable kind of dangerous commodities you can imagine. When it first happened, it was asserted that the brothers had been drinking; there were drugs, etc.

Well you saw in the press yesterday, or the day before, that there was no drugs or alcohol involved. That engineer, and I have to defend Jack Hudson because he was a friend of mine, was driving the train that was only 50 feet shorter than the siding capacity was. Now, they talk about even taking away more regulations, they want to take away the caboose. They wanted to dismantle all the regulations that we have and they want us to go back to a system where it will be profits regulating the safety factor. The Potash Corporation in Saskatchewan presented a brief on "Freedom to Move" and that is exactly what they said. I would suggest to everybody here that is complete nonsense.

We have had a booth here on the caboose. We really appreciate the support we have had here and at this time I would like to express a little gratitude. We in the UTU are only 16,000 members here in Canada; and you do not know how gratifying it is to belong to this great House of Labour, the CLC, because we have had the CLC produce our video. Bob Baker did well. Dick Martin got the thing started; we received help from the Federations of Labour across this country and the labour council, the NDP, federally or provincially and the other two.

MR. A. TOMLINSON (UFAWU): I want to endorse this resolution and mention that, in addition to the human risks that have already been alluded to, our particular interest in the fishery is also very much at risk, particularly in British Columbia. Dangerous commodities, such as vinyl chloride, sulphuric acid and chlorine — just to name three — threaten humans and fish alike, due to a high incidence of derailment and both of our No. 1 and No. 2 salmon rivers are every day at risk.

The recent upgrading of the railway has not significantly improved this condition. Sufficient rock slide and avalanche protection has not been afforded the railways, so the increased traffic is going to mean increased risks to human beings and to our precious resources, the fishery.

In endorsing this resolution, I would like to also urge the CLC to specifically request that this inquiry be instituted under the Inquiries Act, because then we can file for intervener status on behalf of labour and hope to get some finances because we are going to have to be bucking the big corporations, the big railways which appear to have unlimited resources and we need some bucks to be able to have our day in court and get some safety for human beings and for the fishery.

MR. P. FINNETY (BRC): I rise in support. Carmen are the ones who inspect the equipment when it stops at different stations. We are concerned about safety of the public, of our own employees and of our fellow brothers and sisters who work on the equipment while it is in motion.

This includes full passenger and freight equipment. The railways do not care. They do not want public investigations; they do not want concerned unions, concerned public organizations to investigate and find out why derailments have happened. We have an average of a thousand derailments a year. There is no reason for this, the railways have gone and talked to the politicians and tried to get deregulation which allows them to violate the rules and regulations both of the CTC, the RTC, which is supposed to enforce it, and the AAR, in regard to the standards and practices of freight equipment and passenger equipment.

We will work with the UTU, with the Machinists, the Electricians and all other unions. But we need the CLC's help, we need all members of unions and friends and the public. Without that, there will be deregulation and without your help there will be no public inquiries. Our concern is for the safety of our environment, the safety of our fellow brothers and sisters and the safety of everyone.

MR. T. SECORD (UTU): I am employed as an engineman and I get an awful uneasy feeling thinking that, while I am coming down the hill with 10,000 tons of train behind me, I know that the railway has cut back on their inspections, I want to know that all those brakes will work on those cars. I want to know that I will stop before I hit the brick wall at the Welland Canal if the bridge is up.

We need a concerted effort by all the unions representing railway employees, to ensure public safety. The railways are so quick to criticize their own employees but they never look at themselves or their own technology, which, in part, has been known to fail on numerous occasions.

Recently, after the Hinton disaster, the Minister of Transport required a safety blitz on all the railway employees and that consisted of getting a nice little letter from the corporate director of the CNR that said, "Now, take care boys" and a medical that was no different than our periodic medicals we are required to have every two years. I did not find that much of a safety blitz.

With regard to the inspection of the maintenance, here in Ontario, as I am sure everywhere else across Canada, the railways are cutting back on their funds for inspection. In the northern part of Ontario, where employees inspect the tracks, one man used to be responsible for 15 miles of track — he would inspect that track every second day. Right now, before the railway cuts any more, that same man is responsible for 150 miles of track every day. That man is looking after ten times more track and that is 10 times more things that he will not see.

I would like to thank the CBRT & GW and the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen for their support of the UTU's position and I am glad to see that the railway unions and all the other unions and federations of labour are taking a stand against this.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The question has been called. All those in favour of the question being put, please raise your hands. Opposed. The motion is carried.

I will now put the question. Committee's recommendation of concurrence with Resolution TM-40, all those in favour of the Committee's recommendation. Opposed. Carried.

Would the Committee please step down with our thanks for the work that you have done. I would ask the Committee on Occupational Health and Safety to come forward.

MR. P. OSMERS (CUPE): As a point of information, I talked to the Chairperson of the Human Rights Committee yesterday and I was under the understanding that the Human Rights Resolution that got referred to the Committee would be coming back today and it does not appear in the order. I am just wondering is it going to be coming back?

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): We are going to try, brother. My problem is I am having a very difficult time holding the quorum, so I thought that the Safety and Health Committee should come on and we will certainly try as long as the quorum is here.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMITTEE

MR. R. BERNIER (Acting Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Committee): Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I am replacing the Chairperson of our Committee, Brother Clément Godbout, who had to return home. We shall begin with Resolution OHS-20 dealing with the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety, and Sister Margaret Day will read the amended resolution.

MS. M. DAY (Occupational Health and Safety Committee Member):

"WHEREAS the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health has been given federal funding for research into toxic substances; and

"WHEREAS workers affected by these toxic substances continue to die across Canada due to their exposure to these toxic substances; and

"WHEREAS the federal government has cut back federal funding to the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress demand that the federal government reinstate federal funding immediately to the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety."

MR. R. BERNIER (Acting Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Committee): I move concurrence in OHS-20, as amended; seconded by V. Ledger, Committee Secretary.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): The Committee's recommendation is concurrence as amended. Is there anyone that wishes to speak? I do not see anyone at the mikes, all those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please show. Opposed. Motion is carried.

MR. R. BERNIER (Acting Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Committee): Next is Resolution No. OHS-70 covering Resolutions OHS-28, OHS-45 and OHS-55. Brother C. Lambert will read it and, with your permission, will comment on it.

MR. C. LAMBERT (Occupational Health and Safety Committee Member):

"WHEREAS workers are exposed to hazardous substances and agents on a daily basis; and

"WHEREAS the list of potentially hazardous substances continues to grow; and

"WHEREAS usually no standards are set to control worker exposure to these new substances, nor most substances now in place; and

"WHEREAS the few standards that now exist governing toxic substances and agents are of dubious benefit in preventing long-term health problems;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Canadian Labour Congress urge the federal government to have established within the Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety a department that will develop guidelines designed to prevent ill health to workers due to exposure to toxic substances, physical agents and other sources of hazard to human health, including poorly-designed workplaces (ergonomics); and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the CLC and all affiliates strongly lobby governments to adopt the CCOHS guidelines as standards."

MR. R. BERNIER (Acting Chairperson, Occupational Health and Safety Committee): The Committee recommends concurrence and I so move, seconded by C. Lambert.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Did you wish to make a comment from the chair here?

MR. C. LAMBERT (Occupational Health and Safety Committee Member): Yes, please. A major problem for labour organizations across this country is the fact that we have eleven jurisdictions providing standards. Most of those jurisdictions really do not have the ability to set standards, instead they adopt ad hoc guidelines that are set in the United States by a private employer group called "The American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists".

In actual fact, this group is setting law, that changes almost annually, for Canadian workers. The results are poor standards with bad hygienic principles that are unenforceable in the workplace. The Canadian Centre is a federally founded centre. It is our money and labour that exert a large influence on that Centre within the board of governors. In the last six years, the Canadian Centre has become the biggest data bank of occupational health and safety probably in the world. It is now time to put that information to some practical use. The guidelines that this Centre can set must be set with the guiding influence of the governors. It will be a very important job for the labour governors to ensure that this happens.

The guidelines that come out will have to be credible. If they are, it then makes our job much more easy. We will have guidelines that are based on science and not on politics. We will have guidelines that address the problem of ill health, and not the problems of risk assessments. We will have guidelines that will have credibility amongst all our governments because they also have an input to that centre. They will find it very difficult then, with that kind of credibility, to deny us decent hearings and find it very difficult not to set decent standards. So I urge you to adopt this.

MS. D. WIGMORE (NUPGE-MGEA): I am an occupational hygienist working for the provincial government in Manitoba and I rise in support of this resolution for one simple reason. The standards that Brother Lambert referred to are put together by people who are working largely for companies in the United States, who do not usually have workers' interest at heart. If the Canadian Centre was a place that we could go to for standards, we know that labour will have an input and those standards that will result from the discussions that are held will be based on science and not politics and will be based on protecting workers' health.

One thing that would then be taken into account is that we may actually be able to get some standards that recognize that there is no safe level of exposure for carcinogens and the same kind of thing applies to reproductive toxins.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): Thank you. All those in favour of the Committee's recommendation, please signify. Opposed. Carried and so ordered.

MR. R. DICKSON (UAW): Madam Chairperson, I would like to move a motion that we refer the balance of the business of the Convention to the incoming Executive Board, based on the fact that we are very close to not having a quorum in the hall and that this Convention has carried on all of the business that I think is necessary and the Executive can follow up on behalf of the balance. I so move.

CHAIRPERSON (Ms. Carr): It has been moved. Do I have a seconder? It has been moved and seconded that all the business left of this Convention be referred to the incoming Executive to deal with. And on that question, I would like to indicate to you that you have to have 25 per cent of the delegation present in the hall for a quorum and 25 per cent of the almost 3,000 means we should have 700 here.

All those in favour of the motion to refer all further business. Opposed. The motion is carried.

Brothers and sisters, I would like to make a comment to the delegation that is left here. I think this has been an extraordinary Convention, the largest we have had in the history of our movement, and I think the work that we have done and the unity that in fact was shown in this Convention will go down in the history of the labour movement and the Canadian Labour Congress.

I personally would like to thank you and also on behalf of the officers in the Executive Council would like to thank all of you for the content of your debate and for the sincerity that you shown to each other and to our trade union movement.

I, therefore, declare this Convention closed.

The Convention adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

COMMITTEES OF THE 16TH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS

Constitution and Laws Committee
Reg Basken, ECWU, Chairperson
L. Laberge, QFL, Secretary
J. Munro, IWA
A. Burke, PSAC
Bud Clark, ACTWU
G. Docquier, USWA
C. Pilkey, OFL
H. Plamondon, UFCW

Credentials Committee
I. Reilly, UFCW, Chairperson
Lucie Nicholson, CUPE, Secretary
J. MacDonald, PEIFL
Glenda Cooper, NSFL
J.-P. Fortin, UAW
Ronita MacDonald, ECWU

Economic Policy Committee
John Fryer, NUPGE, Chairperson
R. McGarry, LCUC, Secretary
D. Holder, CPU
V. Bourgeois, IAM
Léo Gérard, USWA
Wilf Hudson, MFL
Patricia Blackstaffe, CWC

Education Committee
Jeff Rose, CUPE, Chairperson
G. Wilson, UAW, Secretary
R. Gingerich, CBRT & GW
Jerry Shea, URW
Ian Kirkpatrick, USWA
Jim Dowell, CUPE
Doreen Morton, PSAC

Energy Policy Committee
R. Rasken, ECWU, Chairperson
Jack MacDonald, CUPE Local 1000, Secretary
L. Stevens, USWA
Pat Wocknitz, NUPGE
W. E. Stuart, UMWA
Jim Gill, UAW

General Resolutions Committee
R. White, UAW, Chairperson
Ted Witthames, Molders, Secretary
S.E. Roscoe, SEIU
Louisette Hinton, UFCW
D. Johnston, NWTFL
Madeleine Olivier, UTWA

Government Employees Committee
Daryl Bean, PSAC, Chairperson
W. Findlay, LCUC, Secretary
John Booth, NUPGE
John Claude Laniel, CUPE
Marilyne White, CALFAA

Human Rights Committee
H. Plamondon, UFCW, Chairperson
G. Yetman, NSFL, Secretary
Y.C. Rivard, OPEIU
Sybil Frei, YFL
Fran Soboda, USWA

International Affairs Committee
E.G. Docquier, USWA, Chairperson
R.C. Smith, BRAC, Secretary
Don Collins, RWDSU
R. Hargrove, UAW
Patrick Fortune, PSAC

Legislative Committee
C. Pilkey, OFL, Chairperson
Joy Langan, ITU, Secretary
T. McCarthy, NBFL
G. Neil, ACTRA
S. O'Flynn, OFL

Occupational Health and Safety Committee
C. Godbout, USWA, Chairperson
Verna Ledger, IWA, Secretary
R. Bercier, CWC
Fred Coates, PSAC
D. Ublansky, ECWU
Margaret Day, NUPGE
Colin Lambert, CUPE

Officers' Reports Committee
J. Munro, IWA, Chairperson
Bud Clark, ACTWU, Secretary
A. De Cesare, BCTW
Susie Vallance, NUPGE
D. Anderson, CWC
M. Sjoquist, CMSG

Organization Committee
J. Buchanan, CPU, Chairperson
R. Bezo, ABGWI, Secretary
Michel Rousseau, OPEIU
Julie Griffin, CUPE
J.A. Callaghan, CBRT & GW
R. Cashin, UFCW

Political Education Committee
Bill Parsons, NFL, Chairperson
Nancy Riche, NUPGE, Secretary
Len Harrison, UAW
G. Stoney, IWA
G. Brigden, USWA
J. Hanafin, IAM

Social Action and Services Committee
Art Kube, BCFL, Chairperson
Sylvia Wallace, OPEIU, Secretary
W. Jewers, BCTW
D. Werlin, AFL
G. Blanchard, NUPGE

Committee on Technology
F. Pomeroy, CWC, Chairperson
Roxie Baker, UAW, Secretary
F. Dunberry, CPU
C. Anderson, TWU
J.-C. Parrot, CUPW
Hugh Wagner, GSU

Transportation and Maritime Committee
J. Hunter, CBRT & GW, Chairperson
J.T. Saunders, CALEA/UAW, Secretary
R. Clarke, MWF
Angela Schira, IAM
D.C. Lomas, ILWU
A.W. Davis, CMSG

Women's Committee
Nadine Hunt, SFL, Chairperson
Diane Wood, NUPGE, Secretary
Carol Phillips, UAW
Cynthia Wishart, CUPE
Deborah Smith, UFCW
Michèle Brouillette, CWC

FRATERNAL DELEGATES AND GUESTS — DÉLÉGUÉ(E)S FRATERNEL(LE)S ET INVITÉ(E)S

American Federation of Labour — Congress of Industrial Organizations ... R.I. KILROY

British Trades Union Congress ..... E. SCRIVENS
D. DUTFIELD

SEATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE V, SECTION 10 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS
SIÉGEANT CONFORMÉMENT À L'ARTICLE V, SECTION 10 DE LA CONSTITUTION DU CONGRÈS DU TRAVAIL DU CANADA

DENNIS McDERMOTT ..... President/Président
SHIRLEY G.E. CARR ..... Secretary-Treasurer/ Secrétaire-trésorière
RICHARD MERCIER ..... Executive Vice-President/ Vice-président exécutif
DICK MARTIN ..... Executive Vice-President Vice-président exécutif

REPRESENTATIVES OF AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS — REPRÉSENTANTS D'ORGANISATIONS AFFILIÉES

Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists
Alliance des artistes canadiens du cinéma, de la télévision et de la radio ..... G. MARROCCO
G. NEIL

Aluminium, Brick & Glass Workers' International Union
Syndicat international des ouvriers de l'aluminium, de la brique et du verre ..... R. BEZO

Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union
Travailleurs amalgamés du vêtement et du textile ..... J. ALLERUZZO
C. CLARK

Amalgamated Transit Union
Syndicat uni du transport ..... J. DALEY

American Federation of Grain Millers
Fédération américaine des meuniers ..... L. McCOMBS

Bakery, Confectionery and Tobacco Workers International Union
Syndicat international des travailleurs en boulangerie, en confiserie et du tabac ..... A. DECESARE

Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees
Fraternité des préposés à l'entretien des voies ..... R. GAUDREAU
P.A. LEGROS

Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Grain and Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees
Fraternité des commis de chemins de fer, des lignes aériennes et de navigation, manutentionnaires de fret, employés de messageries et de gares ..... G. FANE
R. SMITH

Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada
Fraternité des wagonniers de chemins de fer des États-Unis et du Canada ..... D. SENEZ

Canadian Actors' Equity Association
Association canadienne des artistes de la scène ..... M. ARDAL

Canadian Air Line Dispatchers Association
Association canadienne des régulateurs de vols ..... A. SANDZIUK

Canadian Air Line Flight Attendants' Association Association du personnel navigant des lignes aériennes canadiennes	J. BANNON T. SLADE
Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers Fraternité canadienne des cheminots, employés des transports et autres ouvriers	R.A. GINGERICH J.D. HUNTER
Canadian Farmworkers' Union Syndicat canadien des ouvriers agricoles	S. BOAL P. SINGH MUKKER
Canadian Merchant Service Guild Guilde de la marine marchande du Canada	R.F. COOK M. SJOQUIST
Canadian Paperworkers Union Syndicat canadien des travailleurs du papier	J.M. BUCHANAN J.A. FERLATTE
Canadian Postmasters and Assistants Association Association Canadienne des maîtres de poste et adjoints	H. CLARK L. JOHNSTON
Canadian Signal & Communications Union Syndicat canadien des signaleurs et des employés des communications	A. CUNNINGHAM J.E. PLATT
Canadian Union of Postal Workers Syndicat des postiers du Canada	B. CHEDORE J.-C. PARROT
Canadian Union of Public Employees Syndicat canadien de la Fonction publique	J.-C. LANIEL J. ROSE
Canadian Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers Union canadienne des travailleurs unis des brasseries, farine, céréales, liqueurs douces et distilleries	W. LUMSDEN
Communications and Electrical Workers of Canada Syndicat des travailleurs et travailleuses en communication et en électricité du Canada	F. POMEROY R. WYATT
Distillery, Wine & Allied Workers' International Union Union internationale des employés de distilleries, vins et industries connexes	R. BISSON
Energy and Chemical Workers Union Syndicat des travailleurs de l'énergie et de la chimie	R. BASKEN R.T. PHILP
Glass, Pottery, Plastics & Allied Workers' International Union Union internationale, verre, poterie, plastique et autres travailleurs	R. ARMSTRONG R. DULUDE
Grain Services Union Syndicat des services du grain	W. HANNA H. WAGNER
Graphic Communications International Union Syndicat international des communications graphiques	L. PAQUETTE R. TOZZI
International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of U.S. and Canada Alliance internationale des employés de la scène et des projectionnistes des États-Unis et du Canada	A. COWLEY D. JONES
International Association of Fire Fighters Association internationale des pompiers	J. JESSOP E. HASTINGS

International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers Association internationale des machinistes et des travailleurs de l'aéroastronautique	V.E. BOURGEOIS A. SCHIRA
International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers Fédération internationale des ingénieurs et techniciens	D. CUPID
International Leather Goods, Plastics and Novelty Workers' Union Union internationale des ouvriers du cuir, plastique et nouveautés	M. SILCOFF
International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union Syndicat international des débardeurs et magasiniers	W. GALLIC D. GARCIA
International Longshoremen's Association Association internationale des débardeurs	N. QUIGLEY D. QUINN
International Molders' and Allied Workers' Union Union internationale des mouleurs et travailleurs associés	E. WHITTHAMES
International Plate Printers, Die Stampers' and Engravers' Union of North America Syndicat international des graveurs et matriceurs de l'Amérique du Nord	W. SMITH
International Typographical Union Union typographique internationale	R. RUDERSDORFER
International Woodworkers of America Syndicat International des travailleurs du bois d'Amérique	J. MUNRO W. POINTON
Letter Carriers' Union of Canada Union des facteurs du Canada	W. FINDLAY R. McGARRY
Marine Workers' Federation Fédération des travailleurs de construction navale	J.K. BELL R.W. CLARKE
Maritime Fishermen's Union Union des pêcheurs des maritimes	G. THERIAULT
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians Association nationale des employés et techniciens en radiodiffusion	A. BERGERON C. NOFTLE
National Union of Provincial Government Employees Syndicat national de la fonction publique provinciale	J. FRYER N. RICHE
Office and Professional Employees' International Union Union internationale des employés professionnels et de bureau	R. CORBEIL W.P. WITTAL
Public Service Alliance of Canada Alliance de la Fonction publique du Canada	D.T. BEAN A.S. BURKE
Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union Union des employés de gros, de détail et de magasins à rayons	D.G. COLLINS A. SCOTT
Seafarers' International Union of Canada Syndicat international des marins canadiens	A. BOYLE R. GRALEWICZ

Service Employees' International Union Union internationale des employés des services	A. GOHIER T. ROSCOE
Shipyard General Workers' Federation of British Columbia Syndicat des ouvriers de chantiers navals de Colombie-Britannique	J. FITZPATRICK R. McCANNEY
Telecommunications Workers' Union Syndicat des travailleurs en télécommunications	D. BREMNER W.G. CLARK
The Newspaper Guild La Guilde des journalistes	D. LOUTH W. McLEMAN
United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America International Union Syndicat international des travailleurs unis de l'automobile, de l'aérospatiale et de l'outillage agricole d'Amérique	B. HARGROVE R. WHITE
United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of Canada Travailleurs unis de l'électricité, de la radio et de la machinerie du Canada	D. BARRY A.E. JENKYN
United Food and Commercial Workers' International Union Syndicat international des travailleurs unis de l'alimentation et du commerce	F. BENN T. KUKOVICA
United Garment Workers of America Travailleurs unis du vêtement d'Amérique	M. DUDEN M. SQUIRES
United Mine Workers of America Mineurs unis d'Amérique	B. STUART
United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America Union des ouvriers unis du caoutchouc, liège, linoleum et plastique d'Amérique	J. SHEA
United Steelworkers of America Métallurgistes unis d'Amérique	G. DOCQUIER
United Textile Workers of America Ouvriers unis des textiles d'Amérique	M. MYSLOWKA

FEDERATIONS OF LABOUR — FÉDÉRATIONS DES TRAVAILLEURS

Alberta Federation of Labour Fédération des travailleurs de l'Alberta	D. AITKEN D. WERLIN
British Columbia Federation of Labour Fédération des travailleurs de la Colombie-Britannique	C. ANDSTEIN A. KUBE
Manitoba Federation of Labour Fédération des travailleurs du Manitoba	S. HART W. HUDSON
New Brunswick Federation of Labour Fédération des travailleurs du Nouveau-Brunswick	T. McCARTHY J.A. RICHARDSON
Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour Fédération des travailleurs de Terre-Neuve et du Labrador	W.A. PARSONS F. TAYLOR
Northwest Territories Federation of Labour Fédération des travailleurs des territoires du Nord-Ouest	R. COUSINS D.J. JOHNSTON

Nova Scotia Federation of Labour
Fédération des travailleurs de la Nouvelle-Écosse ..... G. COOPER
G. YETMAN

Ontario Federation of Labour
Fédération des travailleurs de l'Ontario ..... S. O'FLYNN
C. PILKEY

Prince Edward Island Federation of Labour
Fédération des travailleurs de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard ..... J. MacDONALD

Quebec Federation of Labour
Fédération des travailleurs du Québec ..... F. DAOUST
L. LABERGE

Saskatchewan Federation of Labour
Fédération des travailleurs de la Saskatchewan ..... J. BERNIER
N. HUNT

Yukon Federation of Labour
Fédération des travailleurs du Yukon ..... N. COSNETT
R. PRIEST

LABOUR COUNCILS — CONSEILS DU TRAVAIL

(Atlantic Region — Région Atlantique)

Bathurst and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Bathurst et
de la région ..... Y. GODIN

Campbellton-Dalhousie and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Campbellton-Dalhousie et
de la région ..... M. GRANT
J. McEWEN

Cape Breton and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Cape Breton et
de la région ..... T. CRAWLEY
C. PARSONS

Edmundston and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail d'Edmundston et
de la région ..... M. CLAVETTE

Halifax, Dartmouth and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail d'Halifax, Dartmouth et
de la région ..... J. GUILD
F. LUTLEY

Saint John District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Saint John et
de la région ..... M. BOUCHER
A. LEVINE

St. John's and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de St. John's et
de la région ..... J. VANTA

South Coast and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de South Coast et
de la région ..... G. BRENTON

(Quebec Region — Région du Québec)

Conseil des travailleurs et travailleuses
de l'Estrie
Estrie Labour Council ..... M.A. COTE

Conseil des travailleuses et travailleurs du
Montréal métropolitain
Montréal Labour Council ..... F. BOUDREAU
M. BROUILLETTE

Conseil régional des travailleurs(euses) du centre du Québec Québec Centre and District Labour Council	D. DUBOIS
Conseil du travail de St-Jean et de la région St-Jean and District Labour Council	G. LACHANCE
Conseil du travail de Ste-Thérèse et de la région Ste-Thérèse and District Labour Council	M. CARRIER

(Ontario Region — Région de l'Ontario)

Brampton and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Brampton et de la région	G.A. BENTJ A. KAY
Brantford and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Brantford et de la région	D. HOUSSAR L. McINTYRE
Chatham and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Chatham et de la région	D. McKEEVER B. TURK
Cornwall and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Cornwall et de la région	W.C. OLIVER
Elliot Lake and District Labour Council Conseil du travail d'Elliot Lake et de la région	J. HUSTON R. FRANGIONE
Guelph Labour Council Conseil du travail de Guelph	M. PERHAK M. RAMOTAR
Hamilton and District Labour Council Conseil du travail d'Hamilton et de la région	R. MANN L. SPENCER
Kapuskasing Labour Council Conseil du travail de Kapuskasing	E. ALTOBELLI
Kenora-Keewatin and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Kenora-Keewatin et de la région	B.C. ALCOCK
Kingston Labour Council Conseil du travail de Kingston	F. BELANGER
London and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de London et de la région	J. PARE G. SNEDDON
Midland and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Midland et de la région	D. LUMREE R. WEBSTER
Niagara Falls and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Niagara Falls et de la région	K.G. CRAITOR

North Bay and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de North Bay et de la région	S. CLIFFORD L. HARDWICK
Oakville and District Labour Council Conseil du travail d'Oakville et de la région	D. TREMBLAY
Oshawa and District Labour Council Conseil du travail d'Oshawa et de la région	D. LITTLE
Ottawa and District Labour Council Conseil du travail d'Ottawa et de la région	K. CLAVETTE
Oxford Regional Labour Council Conseil du travail d'Oxford et de la région	J. FLYNN L. KELLESTINE
Peterborough Labour Council Conseil du travail de Peterborough	R. BLACK
Quinte Labour Council Conseil du travail de Quinte	D. SWORD
Renfrew and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Renfrew et de la région	M. HEWITT
St. Catharines and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de St. Catharines et de la région	J. TIFFEN R. WEST
St. Thomas and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de St. Thomas et de la région	B. DELAPENOTIERE
Sarnia and District Labour Cuncil Conseil du travail de Sarnia et de la région	A. CERVI D. HEATH
Sault Ste. Marie and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Sault Ste. Marie et de la région	D. NELSON
Stratford and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Stratford et de la région	R. BAKER D. HARVEY
Thunder Bay and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Thunder Bay et de la région	D. DEVEAU T. MURPHY
(Toronto) Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto Conseil du travail de Toronto et du métropolitain	M. LYONS L. TORNEY
Waterloo Regional Labour Council Conseil du travail régional de Waterloo	A. TURNER R. McGUINESS
Welland and District Labour Council Conseil du travail de Welland et de la région	J. DUERDEN E. JONES

Windsor (Ont.) and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Windsor (Ont.) et
de la région ..... G. CHAPMAN
G.L. PARENT

(Prairie Region — Région des Prairies)

Brandon Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Brandon ..... R.C. MARTIN

Calgary Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Calgary ..... W. PATERSON

Edmonton and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail d'Edmonton et
de la région ..... D. ELVES
A. WILLIAMSON

Red Deer Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Red Deer ..... L. GOULD
C. LACOMBE

Regina and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Régina et
de la région ..... C. BARBER
E.B. FLETCHER

Saskatoon and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Saskatoon et
de la région ..... I. NEWBOLD
D. SIEMENS

Winnipeg and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Winnipeg et
de la région ..... H. GRANT
T. KENNEDY

(Pacific Region — Région du Pacifique)

New Westminster and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de New Westminster et
de la région ..... E. MATSEN
G. STONEY

Peace River and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Peace River et
de la région ..... R. LORD

Prince George and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Prince George et
de la région ..... C.A. DWYER

Vancouver and District Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Vancouver et
de la région ..... D. EVANS
F. KENNEDY

Victoria Labour Council
Conseil du travail de Victoria ..... H. CHELSEA
A. PEL

REPRESENTATIVES OF AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS
REPRÉSENTANTS D'ORGANISATIONS AFFILIÉES

Alberta Provincial Council of Carpenters

Local 01325	Calgary, Alta.	R.A. BOWEN
Local 02103	Calgary, Alta.	P. HAMBROOK
Local 02191	Calgary, Alta.	R.A. BOWEN
Local 03002	Calgary, Alta.	M. PIPER

Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television and Radio Artists
Alliance des artistes canadiens du cinema, de la télévision et de la radio

Journalists	Toronto, Ont.	A. KRASNICK
Performers	Toronto, Ont.	M. HOGARTH
Writers Guild	Toronto, Ont.	D. McLAREN

Aluminium, Brick & Glass Workers' International Union
Syndicat international des ouvriers de l'aluminium, de la brique et du verre

Local 00209G	Toronto, Ont.	R.T. BEER
Local 00203G	Hamilton, Ont.	D. GIBSON
Local 00235	Walleceburg, Ont.	G. WATSON
Local 00246	Wallaceburg, Ont.	R. TACK
Local 00248G	Owen Sound, Ont.	C. POINTON
Local 00259G	Brantford, Ont.	W. STEEP
Local 00260G	Georgetown, Ont.	D. TAYLOR
		M. TREMSCH
Local 00295	Scarborough, Ont.	M. STACEY

Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union
Travailleurs amalgamés du vêtement et du textile

Local 00035H	Winnipeg, Man.	R. BAUTISTA
Local 00115	Montréal, Qué.	L. GOULET
Local 00116	Montréal, Qué.	G. FARRUGGIA
Local 00178	Vancouver, B.C.	R. POLLOCK
Local 00209	Montréal, Qué.	D.J. KALOGERIS
Local 00210C	Toronto, Ont.	F. AQUINO
Local 00233	Toronto, Ont.	M. MOSSEY
Local 00235	Toronto, Ont.	T. PILEGGI
Local 00242	Montréal, Qué.	Y. CALCUTTAWALA
Local 00274	Montréal, Qué.	A. PONZO
Local 00303A	Kitchener, Ont.	O. KUSKOFF
Local 00303B	Kitchener, Ont.	M. ROGERS
Local 00437	Toronto, Ont.	J. MATRAIA
Local 00459	Winnipeg, Man.	W. HAIKO
Local 00459	Winnipeg, Man.	M. RADCHENKA
Local 00527	Montréal, Qué.	M. DESMARAIS
Local 00573	Kitchener, Ont.	A. VIVIAN
Local 00738	Montréal, Qué.	N. KOSHEDUB
Local 00766	Montréal, Qué.	J. NANAS
Local 00858	Montréal, Qué.	N. SMITH
Local 00862	Montréal, Qué.	A. MACKERA
Local 00908	Montréal, Qué.	H. GOYETTE
Local 00971	Kitchener, Ont.	M. BURROWS
Local 00986T	Woodstock, Ont.	L. THIBODEAU
Local 00998	Winnipeg, Man.	K. GRAHAM
Local 01070T	Hamilton, Ont.	W. SHAW
Local 01136	Montréal, Qué.	M. CEASOR
Local 01152	Scarborough, Ont.	V. SKURJAT
Local 01153T	Cambridge, Ont.	C. RUSSELL

Local 01300	Woodstock, Ont.	L. MILLER
Local 01414H	Toronto, Ont.	R. POWER
Local 01464	Toronto, Ont.	G. BOUNTRIS
Local 01476	Midland, Ont.	K. STONEHOUSE
Local 01585-2	Cowansville, Qué.	G. PICARD
Local 01606	Hamilton, Ont.	J. POSTELETHWAITE
Local 01632	Scarborough, Ont.	T. TRACEY
Local 01675	Cornwall, Ont.	R. COLLINS
Local 01685	Don Mills, Ont.	H. WEBSTER
Local 01698	Scarborough, Ont.	V. GONEAU
Local 01756	Cowansville, Qué.	H. NICOL
Local 01774	Ajax, Ont.	R. KEHLER
Local 01813	Toronto, Ont.	S. FRENCH
Local 01814	Don Mills, Ont.	I. HARRIS
Local 01821	Don Mills, Ont.	M. ROBILLARD
Local 01823	Scarborough, Ont.	P. SULLIVAN
Local 01826	London, Ont.	B. FIELD
Local 01857	Stayner, Ont.	B. CHARTERS
Local 01885	Rexdale, Ont.	K. POWELL
Local 01937	Scarborough, Ont.	N. SMITHSON
Local 01967	Hamilton, Ont.	B. McELLISTRUM
Local 02345	Toronto, Ont.	G. KAPETANEAS
Local 02426	Hamilton, Ont.	G. VALA-WEBB

Amalgamated Transit Union
Syndicat uni du transport

Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	P. CLARKE
Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	B. HARE
Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	R. HARNETT
Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	L. KINNEAR
Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	F. MASTRANGELO
Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	P. McLAUGHLIN
Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	A. PATRICK
Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	G. SHEPPARD
Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	J. WALSH
Local 00134	New Westminster, B.C.	E. WALLACE
Local 00279	Vanier, Ont.	J.R. BARRIE
Local 00279	Vanier, Ont.	R. JOLICOEUR
Local 00569	Edmonton, Alta.	P. HEILAND
Local 00569	Edmonton, Alta.	R. NICOLL
Local 00583	Calgary, Alta.	P.R. BROWN
Local 00583	Calgary, Alta.	A.G. BRUCKNER
Local 00616	Ruthen, Ont.	A. CORNELLIER
Local 00741	London, Ont.	J. FITZGERALD
Local 00846	St. Catharines, Ont.	H. KIDDER
Local 00966	Thunder Bay, Ont.	K. MONGRAIN
Local 00987	Lethbridge, Alta.	A.F. MERVYN
Local 01182	Saint John, N.B.	A. FREAKE
Local 01189	Guelph, Ont.	R. SAARINEN
Local 01290	Don Mills, Ont.	K. FOSTER
Local 01350	Winnipeg, Man.	H. CLAYDON

Local 01374	Calgary, Alta.	B. CHALMERS
Local 01374	Calgary, Alta.	M. LITTLE
Local 01505	Winnipeg, Man.	H. COHEN
Local 01572	Mississauga, Ont.	T. TOPPS
Local 01573	Brampton, Ont.	A. MONETTE
Local 01587	Downsview, Ont.	M. CARTER

American Federation of Grain Millers
Fédération américaine des meuniers

Local 00154	London, Ont.	B. LANGFORD
Local 00327	Bramalea, Ont.	C. WAMBOLDT

Bakery, Confectionery and Tobacco Workers International Union
Syndicat international des travailleurs en boulangerie, en confiserie et du tabac

Local 00319T	Toronto, Ont.	M. FUCHS
Local 00320	Montréal, Qué.	M. LEVESQUE
Local 00323T	Guelph, Ont.	F. DUNMORE
Local 00350	St-Léonard, Qué.	H. GAUTHIER
Local 00382	St-Lambert, Qué.	H. AUBIN
Local 00426	Toronto, Ont.	J. LEVY
Local 00446	Halifax, N.S.	W. JEWERS
Local 00468	Burnaby, B.C.	H. BEYER

British Columbia Provincial Council of Carpenters
Conseil des charpentiers de la Colombie-Britannique

Local 00452	Vancouver, B.C.	A. BAIRD
Local 00452	Vancouver, B.C.	T. McNEICE
Local 01251	New Westminster, B.C.	R.W. HUSTON
Local 01540	Kamloops, B.C.	W. ZANDER
Local 01719	Cranbrook, B.C.	M. BURNHAM
Local 02300	Castlegar, B.C.	L. EMBREE

Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees
Fraternité des préposés à l'entretien des voies

Local 00136	Smiths Falls, Ont.	A. PASSARETTI
Local 00497	London, Ont.	L.A. BOLAND
Local 02831	Ottawa, Ont.	W.H. MONTGOMERY

Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks, Grain and Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees
Fraternité des commis de chemins de fer, des lignes aériennes et de navigation, manutentionnaires de fret, employés de messageries et de gares

Local 00650	Thunder Bay, Ont.	J. DZIERGO
Local 00650	Thunder Bay, Ont.	F. MAZUR
Local 00951	Willowdale, Ont.	P. CONLON
Local 01086	Ottawa, Ont.	R. LOCAS
Local 01801	Lachine, Qué.	S. CLARKE
Local 01802	Toronto, Ont.	T. PORTER
Local 01804	Vancouver, B.C.	A. DAVIDSON

Local 01820	Vancouver, B.C.	C. MICKLEWRIGHT
Local 01828	Ottawa, Ont.	R.J. CRANCH
Local 02303	Laval, Qué.	G. LEMIRE
Local 02307	Winnipeg, Man.	A. MACDUFF
Local 02308	London, Ont.	J. BECHTEL
Local 02311	Cambridge, Ont.	S. McNAMARA
Local 02312	Moose Jaw, Sask.	G. MOORE
Local 02319	Hanmer, Ont.	J. CRABB
Local 02324	Rothesay, N.B.	J.R. MARR
Local 02325	Don Mills, Ont.	J. BOYCE
Local 02346	Toronto, Ont.	K. KILLINGBECK

Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada
Fraternité des wagonniers de chemins de fer des États-Unis et du Canada

Local 00280	Langley, B.C.	S.A. HORODYSKI
Local 00371	Winnipeg, Man.	K.R. RICHTER
Local 00450	Melville, Sask.	B.M. TURCHAK
Local 00550	Winnipeg, Man.	O. GONSKE
Local 00619	Scarborough, Ont.	P.J. FINNERTY
Local 00669	St. John's, Nfld.	F.G. CHANCEY
Local 00967	Riverview, N.B.	G. MURPHY

Canadian Air Line Flight Attendants' Association
Association du personnel navigant des lignes aériennes canadiennes

Local 00001	Vancouver, B.C.	B. ZEVIAR
Local 00004	Vancouver, B.C.	K. COLLINS
Local 00005	Vancouver, B.C.	S. WENGER
Local 00006	Vancouver, B.C.	M. KOROTASH
Local 00007	Vancouver, B.C.	F. DOUGLAS
Local 00008	Vancouver, B.C.	P. STIER
Local 00009	Vancouver, B.C.	R. HOLMAN
Local 00011	Vancouver, B.C.	J. SOUTER
Local 00012	Vancouver, B.C.	J. MULLAN
Local 00013	Vancouver, B.C.	B. GREVILLE
Local 00014	Vancouver, B.C.	M. WHITE
Local 00015	Vancouver, B.C.	D. PERSAUD
Local 00017	Vancouver, B.C.	N. FLOCKHART
Local 00018	Vancouver, B.C.	G. WITTIG
Local 00019	Vancouver, B.C.	R. HESS
Local 00020	Vancouver, B.C.	N. NOLAN

Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers
Fraternité canadienne des cheminots, employés des transports et autres ouvriers

Local 00005	Moncton, N.B.	E. FOLEY
Local 00006	Moncton, N.B.	E. DUPUIS
Local 00008	Saint John, N.B.	D.E. ROSS
Local 00009	Truro, N.S.	L. DAURIE

Local 00011	Sydney, N.S.	G.E. DECOURCY
Local 00014	Bedford, N.S.	W.D. HUTT
Local 00020	Albany, P.E.I.	G. MacDONALD
Local 00024	Winnipeg, Man.	H. FALK
Local 00028	Prince George ,B.C.	E. WIKTOROWICZ
Local 00031	Edmonton, Alta.	N. KOWALCHUK
Local 00032	Thunder Bay, Ont.	P. HUBEL
Local 00034	Hamilton, Ont.	R.J. MacDONALD
Local 00037	North Bay, Ont.	G. ETCHES
Local 00040	Kirkland Lake, Ont.	D. SASSEVILLE
Local 00043	Regina, Sask.	O.L. NAGY
Local 00045	Dauphin, Man.	J.L. BROWN
Local 00047	Calgary, Alta.	H.L. CRITCHLEY
Local 00050	Calgary, Alta.	C.M. CRAIG
Local 00052	Ste-Foy, Qué.	J.E. RICHARD
Local 00066	Winnipeg, Man.	M. NOWELL
Local 00067	Oakbank, Man.	K. NAYLOR
Local 00071	Jonquière, Qué.	D. COTE
Local 00076	Toronto, Ont.	J. WERHUN
Local 00079	Edmonton, Alta.	G. PLESUK
Local 00091	Jasper, Alta.	D. SALES
Local 00093	Telkwa, B.C.	R. STORNESS-BLISS
Local 00099	Edmonton, Alta.	P. KRAKE
Local 00100	Burnaby, B.C.	T. FEDUCK
Local 00107	Winnipeg, Man.	J. HAYKO
Local 00110	Ottawa, Ont.	W.R. JOHNSTON
Local 00116	Fort Erie, Ont.	W.G. STORRY
Local 00126	Foxboro, Ont.	R. BELLWOOD
Local 00127	Borden, P.E.I.	K. SIGSWORTH
Local 00134	Don Mills, Ont.	L.S. MANN
Local 00142	Winnipeg, Man.	L. CAMINHA
Local 00146	Don Mills, Ont.	T. STOL
Local 00147	Bedford, N.S.	G. THOMAS
Local 00150	Kamloops, B.C.	M. NICOLA
Local 00154	Burnaby, B.C.	J. JONES
Local 00159	Don Mills, Ont.	T. SINGER
Local 00160	Ottawa, Ont.	M. RIVARD
Local 00167	North Bay, Ont.	W. DERRAH
Local 00170	London, Ont.	A. ERRINGTON
Local 00181	Don Mills, Ont.	P. RASHOTTE
Local 00185	Ottawa, Ont.	R. TINO
Local 00193	Lower Sackville, N.S.	B.E. COOLEN
Local 00206	Montréal, Qué.	I.C. QUINN
Local 00208	Cambridge, Ont.	C. HOADLEY
Local 00209	Winnipeg, Man.	P.L. FOX
Local 00210	Winnipeg, Man.	A. CERILLI
Local 00212	St. Catharines, Ont.	V. HEARN
Local 00216	Bolton, Ont.	R. JONES
Local 00226	Surrey, B.C.	G.T. ROBINSON
Local 00230	Ottawa, Ont.	L. MATTHEWS
Local 00241	Senneterre, Qué.	M. FRENETTE

Local 00253	Winnipeg, Man.	J.A. CRAIG
Local 00260	Ottawa, Ont.	M. CANTLEY
Local 00267	Ottawa, Ont.	M. STUBINSKI
Local 00268	Toronto, Ont.	D. APPLEYARD
Local 00271	Toronto, Ont.	J. TROUPE
Local 00272	Winnipeg, Man.	P. OLLINIK
Local 00273	Calgary, Alta.	P. SEEGOBIN
Local 00275	Vancouver, B.C.	M. DRISCOLL
Local 00276	Victoria, B.C.	J. DUNBAR
Local 00281	Ottawa, Ont.	A. WEPRUK
Local 00282	Chicoutimi, Qué.	F. GIRARD
Local 00283	Scarborough, Ont.	G. MacINNIS
Local 00284	Montréal, Qué.	G. BRISEBOIS
Local 00285	North Sydney, N.S.	J. PARSONS
Local 00286	St. John's, Nfld.	G. BROWN
Local 00288	Moncton, N.B.	V.P. LEGER
Local 00291	Kingston, Ont.	W. CAMPBELL
Local 00295	Ottawa, Ont.	C. MILLER
Local 00298	Cap-de-la-Madeleine, Qué.	S.M. LYNK
Local 00300	Montréal, Qué.	N. LOMBARDI
Local 00301	Montréal, Qué.	R. BIGGAR
Local 00304	Ottawa, Ont.	W. MAZMANIAN
Local 00306	Don Mills, Ont.	V.C. MILANI
Local 00307	Ottawa, Ont.	G. JONES
Local 00308	London, Ont.	R.J. STEVENS
Local 00311	London, Ont.	T. ERSKINE
Local 00312	Pointe St-Charles, Qué.	M. GREGOIRE
Local 00313	Winnipeg, Man.	J. BEYAK
Local 00314	Mt. Pearl, Nfld.	W. MATHESON
Local 00318	Borden, P.E.I.	W. MOORES
Local 00319	Brossard, Qué.	G. DUBUC
Local 00320	Montréal, Qué.	A. RAVARY
Local 00321	Souris, P.E.I.	D. JAY
Local 00323	Iroquois, Ont.	D. HENDERSON
Local 00325	Banff, Alta.	T. McPEEK
Local 00326	Vancouver, B.C.	C.T. DUNCAN
Local 00329	Saskatoon, Sask.	D. MARTIN
Local 00331	Melocheville, Qué.	L.G. BARRETTE
Local 00333	Halifax, N.S.	J.J. DE YOUNG
Local 00334	Ottawa, Ont.	J. MANBERG
Local 00335	Montréal, Qué.	M. HOUDE
Local 00338	Québec, Qué.	J.A. CALLAGHAN
Local 00341	St-Hyancinthe, Qué.	G. COTE
Local 00351	Toronto, Ont.	V. WYLIE
Local 00352	Winnipeg, Man.	G. BARRATT
Local 00353	Markham, Ont.	L. BEASLEY
Local 00354	Lachine, Qué.	L. CHIASSON
Local 00400	Vancouver, B.C.	D. FORSYTH
Local 00401	Port Colborne, Ont.	W. GONYOU
Local 00402	Port Colborne, Ont.	R. GREAVES
Local 00451	Toronto, Ont.	D. TILLEY

Local 00456	Essex, Ont.	D. BARTHOLOMEW
Local 00457	Toronto, Ont.	D.W. O'SHEA
Local 00504	Sydney, N.S.	L. POLLOCK
Local 00505	Truro, N.S.	M. LEWIS
Local 00506	Sydney, N.S.	T. BARRON
Local 00507	Glace Bay, N.S.	B.P. CHIASSON
Local 00509	Glace Bay, N.S.	R.W. WARNER
Local 00510	Sydney, N.S.	D. CAMPBELL
Local 00511	Montréal, Qué.	M.A. GARIEPY
Local 00511	Montréal, Qué.	R. MOREAU
Local 00515	Kitchener, Ont.	R. BILLINGS
Local 00517	Moncton, N.B.	C. MEIER
Local 00518	Willowdale, Ont.	M. ALLUM
Local 00520	Rivière-du-Loup, Qué.	R. LEMELIN
Local 00521	Moncton, N.B.	T. McGRATH
Local 00528	Moncton, N.B.	M.A. TAYLOR
Local 00531	Montréal, Qué.	M. MORETTO
Local 00534	Jasper, Alta.	D.A. STAPLES
Local 00550	Ottawa, Ont.	G. McDONALD
Local 00601	Glace Bay, N.S.	T. ROGERS
Local 00604	New Waterford, N.S.	J. MEERS
Local 00606	Halifax, N.S.	G.J. JOLLYMORE
Local 00606	Sydney, N.S.	B. O'ROURKE
Local 00607	Florence, N.S.	M. MacLEOD
Local 00608	Truro, N.S.	P.J. HARNISH
Local 00609	Inverness, N.S.	C. MacDONALD
Local 00610	Sydney, N.S.	R.G. CHASE
Local 00611	Halifax, N.S.	D. JANES
Local 00612	Truro, N.S.	A. McINTYRE
Local 00613	Dartmouth, N.S.	G.R. SABIN
Local 00614	Halifax, N.S.	J. GLINSKY
Local 00615	Halifax, N.S.	J.A. RITCHIE
Local 00619	Truro, N.S.	J.G. BOUDREAU
Local 00619	Halifax, N.S.	E.A. POWELL
Local 00620	Sydney, N.S.	A. GRANT
Local 00621	Sydney, N.S.	V.J. MacINTYRE

Canadian Merchant Service Guild
Guilde de la marine marchande du Canada

	Eastern Branch, Montréal, Qué.	L. DEMPSEY
	Eastern Branch, Montréal, Qué.	W. HOGG
	Western Branch, Vancouver, B.C.	A.W. DAVIS

Canadian Paperworkers Union
Syndicat canadien des travailleurs du papier

Local 00029	Edmundston, N.B.	J.L. LAFORGE
Local 00030	Saint John, N.B.	M. LEAVITT
Local 00039	Thunder Bay, Ont.	J. HUNTER
Local 00039	Thunder Bay, Ont.	D. HOLDER
Local 00063	Grand Falls, Nfld.	F. TREMBLETT
Local 00088	Grand Falls, Nfld.	A.A. KELLY

Local 00089	Kapuskasing, Ont.	R. PELLOW
Local 00105	Dryden, Ont.	T. DUNN
Local 00109	Iroquois Falls, Ont.	A.N. PAXTON
Local 00113	Kedwick, N.B.	D. Roy
Local 00120	Bathurst, N.B.	J. ROBBINS
Local 00137	Québec, Qué.	J.Y. DROLET
Local 00138	Ste-Anne-de-Beaupré, Qué.	M. GOUSSE
Local 00138	Beaupré, Qué.	C. L'HEUREUX
Local 00139	Grand-Mère, Qué.	P. BOUSQUET
Local 00142	Gatineau, Qué.	R. SANSCARTIER
Local 00146	Dalhousie, N.B.	C. HENRY
Local 00200	Québec, Qué.	R. QUINN
Local 00216	Cap-de-la-Madeleine, Qué.	H. PROVENCHER
Local 00219	Nackawic, N.B.	T. NOEL
Local 00233	Témiscaming, Qué.	F. LATOUR
Local 00250	Québec, Qué.	E. GALLANT
Local 00263	Dalhousie, N.B.	S. BELKINGHAM
Local 00290	Thorold, Ont.	J. HANSON
Local 00304	Toronto, Ont.	J. O'MARA
Local 00306	Fort Frances, Ont.	J. WOODS
Local 00433	Vancouver, B.C.	G. DIEKMAN
Local 00440	New Glasgow, N.S.	D. KEARLEY
Local 00456	Port Coquitlam, B.C.	B. PAYNE
Local 00528	Red Rock, Ont.	A. JONES
Local 00574	New Richmond, Qué.	E. WHITTOM
Local 00603	Prince George, BC.	S. LORD
Local 00641	Stoneham, Qué.	W. DESBIENS
Local 00648	Gatineau, Qué.	A. BOUCHARD
Local 00849	Montréal, Qué.	F. DUNBERRY
Local 00850	Winnipeg, Man.	J. ALEXANDER
Local 01103	Montréal, Qué.	H. VILLENEUVE
Local 01108	Edmonton, Alta.	N. MacLELLAN
Local 01403	The Pas, Man.	C. MONK
Local 01492	Quevillon, Qué.	R. LALANCETTE

Canadian Postmasters and Assistants Association
Association canadienne des maîtres de poste et adjoints

Alta.-N.W.T. Branch, Newbrook, Alta.	H.G. HUMM
B.C. & Yukon Branch, Ucluelet, B.C.	L.E. BATCHELOR
Manitoba Branch, Birtle, Man.	A.J. HUNTER
Maritime Branch, Enfield, N.S.	E.L. BLOIS
Nfld. & Labrador Local, Grand Bank, Nfld.	R. HUNT
Ontario Branch, Finch, Ont.	R.J. ANDERSON
Ontario Branch, Finch, Ont.	D. MARSHALL
Ontario Branch, Finch, Ont.	A. PROCYK
Ontario Branch, Finch, Ont.	R.W. STARKEY
Québec Branch, Normandin, Qué.	J. CHOUINARD
Québec Branch, Normandin, Qué.	T. PEARSON
Québec Branch, Normandin, Qué.	M.A. SAMSON
Québec Branch, Normandin, Qué.	Y. TESSIER
Saskatchewan Branch, Carlyle, Sask.	G. VERBEKE

Canadian Union of Postal Workers
Syndicat des postiers du Canada

Brandon Local, Brandon, Man.	G. FISCHER
Campbellton Local, Campbellton, N.B.	W. MUNDLE
Castlegar Local, Winnipeg, Man.	G. FLORESCO
Cochrane Local, Toronto, Ont.	J. ALLICK
Edmonton Local, Edmonton, Alta.	T. OLENUK
Exploits Valley Local, Grand Falls, Nfld.	G. ASH
Fort Nelson Local, Fort Nelson, B.C.	D. KNIGHT
Fraser Valley Local, New Westminster, B.C.	P. MILLER
Fredericton/Oromocto, Fredericton, N.B.	M. O'NEILL
Guelph Local, Guelph, Ont.	L. GILLIAM
Hamilton Local, Hamilton, Ont.	B. GUST
Kingston Local, Kingston, Ont.	R.W. FLINT
Kitchener Local, Kitchener, Ont.	L. RUDRUM
Lethbridge Local, Lethbridge, Alta.	J. BAIL
London Local, London, Ont.	D. MEEHAN
Moncton Local, Moncton, N.B.	D. TINGLEY
Montréal Local, Montréal, Qué.	F. PAQUIN
Montréal Local, Montréal, Qué.	M. PERREAULT
Ottawa Local, Ottawa, Ont.	R. BURDEN
Port Alberni Local, Port Alberni, B.C.	P. WHITAKER
Powell River Local, Powell River, B.C.	J. LOGUE
Centre Québec Local, Sorel, Qué.	W. GRIMARD
Québec Local, Québec, Qué.	V. TREMBLAY
Red Deer Local, Red Deer, Alta.	J. DAVID
Regina Local, Regina. Sask.	M. BEHRNS
Saskatoon Local, Saskatoon, Sask.	K. JEWORSKI
Scarborough Local, Scarborough, Ont.	R. JONES
Scarborough Local, Scarborough, Ont.	P. PROCENKO
Smithers Local, Smithers, B.C.	L. LUKKARINEN
Swift Current Local, Swift Current, Sask.	J. FEHR
Terrace Local, Terrace, B.C.	D. MILLS
Timmins Local, Timmins, Ont.	C. LEE
Toronto Local, Toronto, Ont.	J. ALVIANO
Toronto Local, Toronto, Ont.	Je. BENNIE
Toronto Local, Toronto, Ont.	Jo. BENNIE
Toronto Local, Toronto, Ont.	B. BUCKELL
Toronto Local, Toronto, Ont.	T. HEFFERNAN
Toronto Local, Toronto, Ont.	V. HUGUES
Toronto Local, Toronto, Ont.	A. KOLOMPAR
Toronto Local, Toronto, Ont.	M. LARKIN
Toronto Local, Toronto, Ont.	L. WILLIAMS
Trail Local, Trail, B.C.	J. SMITH
Vancouver Local, Vancouver, B.C.	E. HOOGERS
Vancouver Local, Vancouver, B.C.	M. POLLACK
Victoria Local, Victoria, B.C.	L. HONEYBOURNE
Williams Lake Local, Williams Lake, B.C.	J. WOODS
Winnipeg Local, Winnipeg, Man.	D. CLARK
Woodstock Local, Woodstock, N.B.	P. MORIN

Canadian Union of Public Employees
Syndicat canadien de la fonction publique

Local 00001	Toronto, Ont.	H. MacLEOD
Local 00004	London, Ont.	D. WRIGHT
Local 00005	Hamilton, Ont.	H. WEBER
Local 00006	Sudbury, Ont.	G. RALPH
Local 00007	Regina, Sask.	D. FLAMAN
Local 00008	Calgary, Alta.	L. NORTHFIELD
Local 00008	Calgary, Alta.	M. SPRINGHETTI
Local 00009	Moose Jaw, Sask.	S. BEHMAN
Local 00021	Regina, Sask.	T. DIZY
Local 00023	Burnaby, B.C.	A. SLEIGHTHOLME
Local 00024	Pembroke, Ont.	G. LEVINE
Local 00027	Windsor, Ont.	R. SYKES
Local 00030	Edmonton, Alta.	K. BALKWILL
Local 00030	Edmonton, Alta.	S. ADDLEY
Local 00037	Calgary, Alta.	D. GALVIN
Local 00037	Calgary, Alta.	J. HEADLEY
Local 00038	Calgary, Alta.	J. CORCORAN
Local 00038	Calgary, Alta.	G. SCOTT
Local 00038	Calgary, Alta.	G. WILLIAMSON
Local 00040	Calgary, Alta.	R. MATTHEWS
Local 00043	Toronto, Ont.	E. GORDON
Local 00043	Toronto, Ont.	L. KOVACSI
Local 00043	Toronto, Ont.	T. LENATHEN
Local 00043	Toronto, Ont.	J. MELE
Local 00043	Toronto, Ont.	L. MURPHY
Local 00043	Toronto, Ont.	M. STOECKLE
Local 00055	Moose Jaw, Sask.	J. SWAOK
Local 00059	Saskatoon, Sask.	J.W. BOA
Local 00063	Toronto, Ont.	E. SKINNER
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	D. BEAL
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	J. BROOME
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	L. BRUMMEL
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	D. CASEY
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	M. COLLINS
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	P. DARKE
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	S. DAVID
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	F. DEMONE
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	G. DIXON
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	R. DOYLE
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	R. DRAXL
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	A. DUBAS
Local 00079	Toronto, Ont.	G. JOHNSON
Local 00082	Windsor, Ont.	M. WARNER
Local 00087	Thunder Bay, Ont.	J.M. MONGRAIN
Local 00101	London, Ont.	R. SHOLTANUK
Local 00103	Toronto, Ont.	P.J. O'KEEFE
Local 00110	Winnipeg, Man.	M. IWASIENKO
Local 00114	Toronto, Ont.	J. DORAN
Local 00116	Vancouver, B.C.	K. ANDREWS

Local 00116	Vancouver, B.C.	M. STEWART
Local 00132	Oshawa, Ont.	B. PYE
Local 00133	Niagara Falls, Ont.	V. SCARINGI
Local 00134	Toronto, Ont.	J. SKEBA
Local 00138	Sudbury, Ont.	W. APPELLE
Local 00148	Sudbury, Ont.	G. LEBEL
Local 00149	Scarborough, Ont.	G. COOPMAN
Local 00150	St. Catharines, Ont.	M. STOKES
Local 00151	St. Catharines, Ont.	M. MATTHEWS
Local 00155	St. Catharines, Ont.	T. KELLY
Local 00157	St. Catharines, Ont.	K. NESBITT
Local 00167	Hamilton, Ont.	D. MacLEOD
Local 00176	Regina, Sask.	G. WINDRUM
Local 00182	Calgary, Alta.	M. CREFMAN
Local 00185	Toronto, Ont.	D. MacLEAN
Local 00207	Sudbury, Ont.	R. GLEASON
Local 00218	Whitby, Ont.	B. DEMPERS
Local 00228	Flin Flon, Man.	I. YOUNG
Local 00250	Oshawa, Ont.	R. GOODING
Local 00256	Guelph, Ont.	A. GEORGE
Local 00305	Montréal, Qué.	P. INGENITO
Local 00311	Noranda, Qué.	G. LANDRY
Local 00336	Selkirk, Man.	P. MOIST
Local 00338	Kelowna, B.C.	J. KELLY
Local 00339	Vancouver, B.C.	D. JOLLY
Local 00368	Agincourt, Ont.	L. THIFFAULT
Local 00379	Burnaby, B.C.	C. JORDAN
Local 00386	Coquitlam, B.C.	T. SPOONER
Local 00388	Victoria, B.C.	C. GRAHAM
Local 00389	Vancouver, B.C.	M. KERRY
Local 00401	Nanaimo, B.C.	M. DUMLER
Local 00402	Surrey, B.C.	J. LE MAISTRE
Local 00407	Burnaby, B.C.	M. D'AMICO
Local 00410	Victoria, B.C.	B. BIG CANOE
Local 00417	Red Deer, Alta.	R. MALCOLM
Local 00429	Montréal, Qué.	A. LALANDE
Local 00488	Corner Brook, Nfld.	D. RYAN
Local 00500	Winnipeg, Man.	R. BEHRENDT
Local 00500	Winnipeg, Man.	E. BLACKMAN
Local 00500	Winnipeg, Man.	J. BURNS
Local 00500	Winnipeg, Man.	G. COYSTON
Local 00500	Winnipeg, Man.	D. KINNIBURGH
Local 00500	Winnipeg, Man.	R. LAND
Local 00500	Winnipeg, Man.	S. MILIMAC
Local 00500	Winnipeg, Man.	S. MORTLOCK
Local 00500	Winnipeg, Man.	J. NEIL
Local 00503	Ottawa, Ont.	L. CAPELLO
Local 00503	Ottawa, Ont.	A. CARON
Local 00503	Ottawa, Ont.	R. DINELLE
Local 00503	Ottawa, Ont.	R. CARDIFF
Local 00528	Leamington, Ont.	J. ANDERSON

Local 00535	Ottawa, Ont.	J. DOWELL
Local 00545	Scarborough, Ont.	P. PERKINS
Local 00561	Coquitlam, B.C.	G. CAMPBELL
Local 00569	St. John's, Nfld.	T. O'LEARY
Local 00606	Nanaimo, B.C.	L. WILLIAMSON
Local 00666	St. John's, Nfld.	K. HILMER
Local 00667	Toronto, Ont.	B. MAY
Local 00668	Ottawa, Ont.	R. PATERSON
Local 00670	St. John's, Nfld.	A. WATERSON
Local 00676	Ottawa, Ont.	R. RAYMOND
Local 00677	Toronto, Ont.	B. CARLYLE
Local 00678	Windsor, Ont.	B. THORSTEINSON
Local 00679	Windsor, Ont.	L. CARTER
Local 00681	Calgary, Alta.	M. LORENZ
Local 00683	Ste-Foy, Qué.	M. POULIOT
Local 00688	Corner Brook, Nfld.	J.E. MELLING
Local 00692	Halifax, N.S.	G. JOHNSON
Local 00694	Headingley, Man.	D. MEYER
Local 00709	Calgary, Alta.	J. JACOBSON
Local 00716	Richmond, B.C.	P. CHARLES
Local 00727	Port Alberni, B.C.	G. JONES
Local 00728	Surrey, B.C.	P. WORONIUK
Local 00741	New Glasgow, N.S.	A.K. CUNNINGHAM
Local 00771	Toronto, Ont.	C. BAIRD
Local 00778	Hamilton, Ont.	L. HILL
Local 00783	Cornwall, Ont.	H. FETTERLY
Local 00786	Hamilton, Ont.	T. STEELE
Local 00787	Grande Prairie, Alta.	F.M. BROWN
Local 00794	Hamilton, Ont.	A. GIBSON
Local 00808	Etobicoke, Ont.	J. McLAUGHLAN
Local 00831	Brampton, Ont.	R.J. BENHAM
Local 00835	Yarmouth, N.S.	P.N. STODDARD
Local 00838	Red Deer, Alta.	P. ROMBOUTS
Local 00847	Burnaby, B.C.	J. DENOFREO
Local 00855	Lindsay, Ont.	G. JORDAN
Local 00856	Dalhousie, N.B.	B. HUARD
Local 00859	Saskatoon, Sask.	M. HNATIUK
Local 00870	Ottawa, Ont.	M. HURLEY
Local 00883	Stittsville, Ont.	P. OSMERS
Local 00895	Sudbury, Ont.	J.C. OOST
Local 00900	Kamloops, B.C.	L. BROOKS
Local 00904	New Liskeard, Ont.	A. GAUVREAU
Local 00904	New Liskeard, Ont.	D. McLELLAN
Local 00906	Ajax, Ont.	P. BARRY
Local 00907	Kingston, Ont.	J. WALKER
Local 00911	St. Catharines, Ont.	G. NORTON
Local 00930	Montréal, Qué.	R. CROTEAU-CROZE
Local 00947	Victoria, B.C.	H.C. BARNES
Local 00951	Victoria, B.C.	G. McGUIRE
Local 00966	Brampton, Ont.	R. FERGUSON
Local 00967	Toronto, Ont.	R. GARCIA-BAREA

Local 00974	Saskatoon, Sask.	S. BRAIDEK
Local 00982	London, Ont.	P. SENAY
Local 00990	Grand Falls, Nfld.	A. EARLE
Local 00994	Bramalea, Ont.	D. PATON
Local 00998	Winnipeg, Man.	S. DENESIUK
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	B. BERRY
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	C. CHENNELLS
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	J. FILMAN
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	D. HEFFERNAN
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	E. HOUGH
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	B. KIRKCONNELL
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	J. MacDONALD
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	G. McCABE
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	D. McKINNON
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	P. McRORIE
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	J. MURPHY
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	R. SCHWEYER
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	D. SHAW
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	K.C. CUMMINGS
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	L. URBAN
Local 01000	Toronto, Ont.	A. WALTON
Local 01002	Portage La Prairie, Man.	C. LAMBERT
Local 01003	Toronto, Ont.	J. READ
Local 01004	Vancouver, B.C.	D. FOSTER
Local 01004	Vancouver, B.C.	N. MacKENZIE
Local 01004	Vancouver, B.C.	K. DAVIDSON
Local 01011	Hamilton, Ont.	G. ALLAN
Local 01028	Dartmouth, N.S.	B. WARRELL
Local 01032	Brooks, Alta.	C. SHIELD
Local 01082	Halifax, N.S.	H. MILBURY
Local 01091	Delta, B.C.	E. HELGREN
Local 01097	St. Catharines, Ont.	A. WILLIAMSON
Local 01106	Etobicoke, Ont.	V. CHIASSON
Local 01108	Ste-Foy, Qué.	R. ALLARD
Local 01113	Pont-Viau, Laval, Qué.	J. VACHON
Local 01114	Sherbrooke, Qué.	R. LESSARD
Local 01115	Welland, Ont.	T. MOREY
Local 01132	Tecumseh, Ont.	L. TURNER
Local 01138	Regina, Sask.	J. BEATTIE
Local 01144	Toronto, Ont.	C. McQUARRIE
Local 01145	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	R. CROCKETT
Local 01166	London, Ont.	G. MacDONALD
Local 01169	Calgary, Alta.	M. McCREARY
Local 01185	Digby, N.S.	H. LENNON
Local 01190	Fredericton, N.B.	G. ARSENEAULT
Local 01190	Fredericton, N.B.	J. FERRON
Local 01190	Fredericton, N.B.	G. HEBERT
Local 01190	Fredericton, N.B.	J. SIROIS
Local 01224	Sherbrooke, Qué.	M. MELANCON
Local 01230	Toronto, Ont.	T. BRIBRIESCO
Local 01240	Calgary, Alta.	L. GODIN

Local 01244	Montréal, Qué.	M. BRULOTTE
Local 01245	Halifax, N.S.	J.J. HARVEY
Local 01260	Burnaby, B.C.	D. ADAMS
Local 01263	St. Catharines, Ont.	P. FREEMAN
Local 01265	Downsview, Ont.	F. ALEXANDER
Local 01267	Mission, B.C.	D. HILDEBRANDT
Local 01271	St. John's, Nfld.	F. MATTHEWS
Local 01274	Ville de Vanier, Qué.	R. POULIN
Local 01280	Scarborough, Ont.	L. MELE
Local 01281	Toronto, Ont.	R. SCHEV
Local 01285	Rossland, B.C.	E. HAGGAN
Local 01287	St. Catharines, Ont.	E. WALDRON
Local 01289	St. John's, Nfld.	D.C. BISHOP
Local 01295	St. Catharines, Ont.	J. JOHNSTON
Local 01302	Kingston, Ont.	W.D.R. MILLAGE
Local 01310	Barrie, Ont.	S. STREET
Local 01317	Thorold, Ont.	S. AMADIO
Local 01320	Ottawa, Ont.	M. PATERSON
Local 01325	Toronto, Ont.	S. DONALDSON
Local 01328	West Hill, Ont.	J. ROWAN
Local 01334	Guelph, Ont.	R.G. ANDERSON
Local 01344	Hamilton, Ont.	R. BROWNRIDGE
Local 01348	Amherstburg, Ont.	R. NUNNEY
Local 01353	Downsview, Ont.	K. HACK
Local 01357	Hinton, Alta.	M. HOUSE
Local 01357	Hinton, Alta.	C. LETENDRE
Local 01359	Keswick, Ont.	P. STRICKLEY
Local 01400	Ottawa, Ont.	J.R. CALBERT
Local 01442	St. Catharines, Ont.	E. HOVEY
Local 01445	Red Deer, Alta.	J.D. MURRAY
Local 01486	Regina, Sask.	J. KEMP
Local 01487	Scarborough, Ont.	D. SANGSTER
Local 01505	Ft. McMurray, Alta.	G. COURCHESNE
Local 01508	Burnstown, Ont.	C. WISHART
Local 01511	Montréal, Qué.	S. LALONDE
Local 01522	Winnipeg, Man.	H. MATTHEWS
Local 01550	Winnipeg, Man.	D. COUTU
Local 01550	Winnipeg, Man.	K. HOUSTON
Local 01550	Winnipeg, Man.	C. JOHNSON
Local 01560	St. John's, Nfld.	T. MAYO
Local 01563	Sarnia, Ont.	I.K. HILLIER
Local 01569	Westmount, Qué.	D. CROMBIE
Local 01573	Québec, Qué.	A. DIONNE
Local 01582	Toronto, Ont.	J. DARCY
Local 01590	Scarborough, Ont.	A. SPENCE
Local 01594	Regina, Sask.	L. WAHL
Local 01599	Winnipeg, Man.	D. MULOIN
Local 01608	Arborg, Man.	C. DERHAM
Local 01613	Sydney, N.S.	M. McINTYRE
Local 01615	St. John's, Nfld.	P. CAVE
Local 01629	Winnipeg, Man.	B. McMANAMAN

Local 01638	Ste-Foy, Qué.	R. HOUDE
Local 01657	Ottawa, Ont.	M. DE GIOVANNI
Local 01681	Windsor, Ont.	S. BOWDITCH
Local 01727	Timmins, Ont.	R. LOISELLE
Local 01733	Laval, Qué.	Y. LAMONTAGNE
Local 01742	St. Catharines, Ont.	G.W. WILSON
Local 01744	Toronto, Ont.	B. SEEK
Local 01749	Toronto, Ont.	K. McGOVERN
Local 01750	Don Mills, Ont.	R. CARNOVALE
Local 01750	Don Mills, Ont.	C. HAFFENDEN
Local 01750	Don Mills, Ont.	W. KURTH
Local 01764	Oshawa, Ont.	W.J. HARFORD
Local 01767	Delta, B.C.	D.G. ROBSON
Local 01770	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	R. ARSENAULT
Local 01772	Unity, Sask.	G. VANDERLINDE
Local 01781	Kenora, Ont.	M. FULTON
Local 01784	Cobourg, Ont.	T. O'CONNOR
Local 01804	Terrace, B.C.	J. LAMB
Local 01806	Toronto, Ont.	B. WILSON
Local 01816	Vancouver, B.C.	S. FILLEUL
Local 01858	Nanaimo, B.C.	B. KIRK
Local 01871	Saskatoon, Sask.	S. SMART
Local 01874	Bramalea, Ont.	D. DOCHERTY
Local 01883	Kitchener, Ont.	M. WHALEY
Local 01904	Yorkton, Sask.	J. AHLERS
Local 01914	Brandon, Man.	C. CARLSON
Local 01953	Queensville, Ont.	A. MONTAGNESE
Local 01974	Kingston, Ont.	S. CUPIDO
Local 01974	Kingston, Ont.	A. SEARS
Local 01975	Regina, Sask.	D. DANYLCHUK
Local 01975	Saskatoon, Sask.	A. ENS
Local 01975	Saskatoon, Sask.	G. MAKAHONUK
Local 01983	Montréal, Qué.	P. DUCAP
Local 01983	Montréal, Qué.	J. FLYNN
Local 01983	Montréal, Qué.	G. GIGUERE
Local 01983	Montréal, Qué.	M. HUNTER
Local 01983	Montréal, Qué.	G. JOYCE
Local 01983	Montréal, Qué.	A. MESSIER
Local 01983	Montréal, Qué.	M. VEZINA
Local 01989	Mississauga, Ont.	R. ROLFE
Local 01996	Downsview, Ont.	T. HUNT
Local 02000	Montréal, Qué.	G. MARTIN
Local 02000	Montréal, Qué.	C. MORRISSEAU
Local 02012	Burnaby, B.C.	G. ERRINGTON
Local 02023	St. Catharines, Ont.	R. VEILLETTE
Local 02028	Windsor, Ont.	C.G. MASSE
Local 02046	New Waterford, N.S.	G.J. O'NEILL
Local 02051	Québec, Qué.	R. HOTTE
Local 02059	Ottawa, Ont.	C. DUNGEY
Local 02064	Mount Hope, Ont.	W.F. BROWN
Local 02079	Moncton, N.B.	N.J. BOURQUE

Local 02105	Laval, Qué.	M. CHAUVETTE
Local 02111	Edmonton, Alta.	P. MORTON
Local 02114	Wainwright, Alta.	J. DEVISSER
Local 02121	Hawkesbury, Ont.	B. DAVIS
Local 02148	Montréal, Qué.	Y. LAVOIE
Local 02157	Fort McMurray, Alta.	R. SYLVESTRE
Local 02165	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	K. CHARSLEY
Local 02184	Montréal, Qué.	A. MORRISON
Local 02187	Ottawa, Ont.	L.G. MARKS
Local 02191	Toronto, Ont.	P. MAYE
Local 02204	Ottawa, Ont.	R. BALNIS
Local 02213	Montréal, Qué.	G. ETHIER
Local 02220	St. Catharines, Ont.	C. HAECK
Local 02241	Burnaby, B.C.	L. STAIR
Local 02269	Burnaby, B.C.	M.L. KRAMER
Local 02296	Thunder Bay, Ont.	J. BERTINUSON
Local 02306	St. John's, Nfld.	B. MATTHEWS
Local 02307	Bernières, Qué	A. MOREAU
Local 02323	Ottawa, Ont.	D. KROPP
Local 02328	St. Catharines, Ont.	T. BAXTER
Local 02348	Winnipeg, Man.	B. WOOD
Local 02360	Ste-Foy, Qué.	L. HARVEY
Local 02410	Vegreville, Alta.	R. JONGSMA
Local 02419	Regina, Sask.	H. MAGON
Local 02424	Ottawa, Ont.	S. GRUDA
Local 02437	Ottawa, Ont.	J. KING
Local 02441	Charlesbourg, Qué.	G. CAREAU
Local 02446	Desberats, Ont.	L. NICHOLSON
Local 02449	St. John's, Nfld.	L. POWER
Local 02509	Winnipeg, Man.	N. ADDISON
Local 02545	Fort McMurray, Alta.	K. BREBANT
Local 02549	Québec, Qué.	B. MERCIER
Local 02574	St. Anthony, Nfld.	D. MEANEY
Local 02582	Saskatoon, Sask.	G. CAUDLE
Local 02595	Ottawa, Ont.	B. COSTIGLIOLA
Local 02669	Saskatoon, Sask.	B. SADOWAY
Local 02679	St-Laurent, Qué.	L. BARRETTE
Local 02680	Montréal, Qué.	A.M. BOURQUE
Local 02699	Abbotsford, B.C.	J. QUAIL
Local 02702	Seaforth, Ont.	S. HENNESSY
Local 02722	Toronto, Ont.	M.V. CORKERY
Local 02770	Ottawa, Ont.	A. BERUBE
Local 02776	Wabamum, Alta.	J. DIVITT
Local 02802	Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ont.	L. DUTTON
Local 02808	Québec, Qué.	C. BUSSIERES
Local 02850	Montréal, Qué.	D. MASSON
Local 02960	Montréal, Qué.	L. CAUCHY
Local 02885	Montréal, Qué.	R. GAGNON
Local 02885	Montréal, Qué.	M. GIRARD
Local 02893	North Bay, Ont.	A. BOWES
Local 02967	Montréal, Qué.	L. McBREEN

Local 02969	Montréal, Qué.	P. RODGERS
Local 02976	Perth, Ont.	M.P. BURKE
Local 02979	Vancouver, B.C.	J. GEROW
Local 03033	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	H. O'REGAN
Local 03540	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	C. WILSON
AHEU	Edmonton, Alta.	E. MITCHELL
AHEU	Edmonton, Alta.	H. PUFF
CUE	Vancouver, B.C.	P. HOUSE

Canadian Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers
Union canadienne des travailleurs unis des brasseries, farine, céréales, liqueurs douces et distilleries

Local 00227	Beausejour, Man.	R. SMYRICHINSKY
Local 00248	Red Deer, Alta.	M. JOHNSTON
Local 00278	Rexdale, Ont.	F. KIESWETTER
Local 00305	Sudbury, Ont.	J. WEIR
Local 00306	Barrie, Ont.	J. YONEYAMA
Local 00326	Rexdale, Ont.	P. MAGEE
Local 00330	Winnipeg, Man.	H. LOSTER
Local 00335	Rexdale, Ont.	R. AYRES
Local 00336	Brantford, Ont.	B. NOONAN
Local 00350	Edmonton, Alta.	B. SMITH
Local 00358	Rexdale, Ont.	E.G. REED
Local 00361	Halifax, N.S.	G. FORAN

Communications and Electrical Workers of Canada
Syndicat des travailleurs et travailleuses en communication et en électricité du Canada

Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	D. ANDERSON
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	J. SCHREFFLER
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	L. LANE
Local 00002	Saskatoon, Sask.	R. BIDWELL
Local 00003	Regina, Sask.	D. POITRAS
Local 00004	Toronto, Ont.	J. GRAY
Local 00005	Winnipeg, Man.	E. CLUNE
Local 00006	Timmins, Ont.	P. KLYM
Local 00007	Winnipeg, Man.	B. MARTIN
Local 00009	Toronto, Ont.	E.H. NORTON
Local 00016	Toronto, Ont.	M.E. WILSON
Local 00022	Regina, Sask.	P. BLACKSTAFFE
Local 00025	Toronto, Ont.	R. HAWES
Local 00025	Toronto, Ont.	G. MULLEY
Local 00026	Mississauga, Ont.	V. MORDEN
Local 00026	Mississauga, Ont.	R. MORTIMER
Local 00027	Don Mills, Ont.	G. SNEE
Local 00029	Omemee, Ont.	J.W. ISAAL
Local 00030	Belleville, Ont.	D. NEWMAN
Local 00031	Kingston, Ont.	H.M. OTTENHOF
Local 00032	Toronto, Ont.	W.N. BURNS
Local 00034	Ottawa, Ont.	K. CHARMAN
Local 00036	North Bay, Ont.	L.J. BROWN

Local 00037	Sudbury, Ont.	G. ADAM
Local 00038	Toronto, Ont.	R.C. LONG
Local 00040	Toronto, Ont.	G. CWITCO
Local 00042	Hamilton, Ont.	D.T. WILSON
Local 00043	Thorold, Ont.	M. LETOURNEAU
Local 00045	Brantford, Ont.	B. WARD
Local 00047	Windsor, Ont.	L. RENAUD
Local 00050	Toronto, Ont.	G. LARTER
Local 00051	Ottawa, Ont.	D.R. ROBINSON
Local 00052	Newmarket, Ont.	J. McCLELLAND
Local 00080	Hull, Qué.	R. BERCIER
Local 00086	Verdun, Qué.	C. CHARLEBOIS
Local 00401	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	T. CULLEN
Local 00410	St. John's, Nfld.	N. FLYNN
Local 00522	St-Laurent, Qué.	J.P. BLANCHARD
Local 00532	Midland, Ont.	J. COUNAHAN
Local 00534	Cobourg, Ont.	L. NICHOLAS
Local 00537	Trenton, Ont.	J. FOLEY
Local 00544	Oakville, Ont.	J. CUMMING
Local 00545	St. Catharines, Ont.	V. COPELAND
Local 00545	Mississauga, Ont.	A. PRINCIPE
Local 00549	Toronto, Ont.	N. SCHUST
Local 00553	Brantford, Ont.	G. PATTINSON
Local 00574	Owen Sound, Ont.	D. MARTIN
Local 00591	Edmonton, Alta.	A. PRYDE
Local 00595	Cambridge, Ont.	H. BOOMER
Local 00599	Peterborough, Ont.	J. LOUCKS

Distillery, Wine & Allied Workers' International Union
Union internationale des employés de distilleries, vins et industries connexes

Local 00048	Cambridge, Ont.	J. GORDON
Local 00064	LaSalle, Qué.	C. CARRIER

Energy and Chemical Workers Union
Syndicat des travailleurs de l'énergie et de la chimie

Local 00001	Willowdale, Ont.	B. HAYES
Local 00008	Brampton, Ont.	M. O'LEARY
Local 00028	Lyn, Ont.	G. PETTEM
Local 00039	Listowel, Ont.	W. McTAGGART
Local 00045	Newmarket, Ont.	D. UBLANSKY
Local 00048	Saskatoon, Sask.	D.W. JOSEPHSON
Local 00067	Willowdale, Ont.	D. VAN NOSTRAND
Local 00069	London, Ont.	K.V. ROGERS
Local 00132	Montréal, Qué.	G. PARENT
Local 00141	Montréal, Qué.	W. LAVERY
Local 00143	Valleyfield, Qué.	F. GAGNE
Local 00294	Havelock, Ont.	E. BATTEN
Local 00300	Sarnia, Ont.	D. PRETTY
Local 00400	Edmonton, Alta.	N. SCHINDEL

Local 00435	Aurora, Ont.	J. MORE
Local 00501	Edmonton, Alta.	C.N. REIMER
Local 00513	Willowdale, Ont.	B. MacDONALD
Local 00517	Willowdale, Ont.	G. HENRY
Local 00541	Gatineau, Qué.	E. NELSON
Local 00594	Regina, Sask.	S. MICHALUK
Local 00595	Esterhazy, Sask.	T. HAAS
Local 00601	Burnaby, B.C.	R.A. WHITE
Local 00633	Burlington, Ont.	R. McVEA
Local 00649	Regina, Sask.	G. STEININGER
Local 00666	Edmonton, Alta.	W. KOLBA
Local 00672	Sarnia, Ont.	J. HALEY
Local 00728	Edmonton, Alta.	H. GAUTHIER
Local 00746	Burstall, Sask.	E. LAPOINTE
Local 00758	Windsor, Ont.	L. GIRARD
Local 00764	London, Ont.	J. BOLDUC
Local 00773	Calgary, Alta.	G. SHURY
Local 00795	Willowdale, Ont.	L. PHILLIPS
Local 00800	Sarnia, Ont.	T. LILLEY
Local 00848	Sarnia, Ont.	R. TAYLOR
Local 00851	Whitecourt, Alta.	W. HOLMES
Local 00876	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	S. SULLIVAN
Local 00892	Esterhazy, Sask.	R. BEITEL
Local 00909	Edmonton, Alta.	A. THEOBALD
Local 00911	Regina, Sask.	E. JESPERSEN
Local 00914	Sarnia, Ont.	N.F. BRAIN
Local 00914	Sarnia, Ont.	J.R. HEALEY
Local 00914	Sarnia, Ont.	B. KINART
Local 00927	Charlesbourg Ouest, Qué.	A. RAICHE
Local 00938	London, Ont.	D. SCRIVENS
Local 00999	Chatham, Ont.	C.F. O'RAE
Local 06720	Ottawa, Ont.	G. DELORY

FTQ-Construction

FIPOE	Montréal, Qué.	J. LAVALLEE

Glass, Pottery, Plastics & Allied Workers' International Union
Union internationale, verre, poterie, plastique et autres travailleurs

Local 00231	Toronto, Ont.	F. PELUSO
Local 00366	Oakville, Ont.	V. COLOSIMO
Local 00367	Cornwall, Ont.	R. BRISSARD

Grain Services Union
Syndicat des services du grain

S.W.P. Local	Regina, Sask.	H. LAMONTAGNE
S.W.P. Local	Regina, Sask.	D. TAYLOR

Graphic Communications International Union
Syndicat international des communications graphiques

Local 00010	Willowdale, Ont.	A.W. Hall
Local 00145	Montréal, Qué.	D. McKAY
Local 00145	Montréal, Qué.	Y. ROUSSEAU
Local 00466	Willowdale, Ont.	J. ELLIOT
Local 00466	Willowdale, Ont.	R. TOWNSEND
Local 00500	Toronto, Ont.	K. MAGNUS

Hospital Employees' Union
Syndicat des employés d'hôpitaux

Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	H. BURNELL
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	K. ANDERSON
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	N. ANDERSON
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	B. BAILEY
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	M. BARKER
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	K. BOYD
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	J. HARVEY
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	B.G. CATTO
Local 00180	Burnaby, B.C.	K. CHERRIS
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	J. COOKE
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	S.P. DAVIES
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	H. DAVIS
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	J. DAWSON
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	A. DORVAL
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	W.D. BALLARD
Local 00180	Trail, B.C.	L. BIBO
Local 00180	Trail, B.C.	G. GOLDADE
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	G. GOOCH
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	P. HALL
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	R. HARDWICK
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	C. HEIN
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	D. JEFFERY
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	J.G. JOHNSTON
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	R. L'HEUREUX
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	M. LAPLANTE
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	G.L. LARGE
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	.H. LEE TOO
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	B. MacDONALD
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	N. MacDONALD
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	E. MARSHALL
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	T. MOIMOI
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	F. MUZIN
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	J. NORLIN
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	D. PERRY
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	C. RANDLE
Local 00180	Nelson, B.C.	J.S. REESE
Local 00180	Parksville, B.C.	J. RUSSELL
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	J. SERAFINI
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	S. SHARP
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	P. SHIPLACK

Local 00180	Sardis, B.C.	T.S. SIEMENS
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	S. VOHRA
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	T. WILDEMAN
Local 00180	Vancouver, B.C.	D. WINDSOR

Hotel Employees' and Restaurant Employees' International Union
Union internationale des employés d'hôtels et de restaurants

Local 00031	Montréal, Qué.	J. STAMOS
Local 00040	Burnaby, B.C.	J. ARNOLD
Local 00040	Burnaby, B.C.	R.J. BONAR
Local 00040	Burnaby, B.C.	M. KLEIN
Local 00040	Burnaby, B.C.	L. RANKIN
Local 00075	Toronto, Ont.	J. ADAMS
Local 00075	Toronto, Ont.	J.G. BELANGER
Local 00075	Toronto, Ont.	L. BROWN
Local 00075	Toronto, Ont.	F. CABRITA
Local 00075	Toronto, Ont.	H. GREEN
Local 00075	Toronto, Ont.	A. JEROME
Local 00075	Toronto, Ont.	L. MAN KEE
Local 00075	Toronto, Ont.	C. MARSHALL
Local 00075	Toronto, Ont.	G. PINEO
Local 00088	Richmond Hill, Qué.	A. KENNOWAY
Local 00088	Richmond Hill, Qué.	J. WHYTE
Local 00206	Winnipeg, Man.	E. GORALSKI
Local 00261	Ottawa, Ont.	F. DE PEDRO
Local 00261	Ottawa, Ont.	E. DUNN
Local 08470	Charlesbourg, Qué.	G. PROULX

International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees
and Moving Picture Machine Operators of U.S. and Canada
Alliance internationale des employés de la scène et
des projectionnistes des États-Unis et du Canada

Local 00173	Toronto, Ont.	G. HULSE
Local 00873	Toronto, Ont.	H. MONTGOMERIE

International Association of Fire Fighters
Association internationale des pompiers

Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	G. GRIEVE
Local 00113	Toronto, Ont.	P. McCABE
Local 01068	Etobicoke, Ont.	V. CLARK

International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers
Association internationale des machinistes et des
travailleurs de l'aéroastronautique

Local 00054	Kingston, Ont.	G. LAWLOR
Local 00110	Stratford, Ont.	D. GRAHAM
Local 00118	Montréal, Qué.	Y. VIEL
Local 00235	Islington, Ont.	S. CONNOR
Local 00357	Calgary, Alta.	L. ERLICHMAN
Local 00412	Ottawa, Ont.	R. MORIN
Local 00423	Chateauguay, Qué.	M. FAFARD

Local 00484	Winnipeg, Man.	W. CAMERON
Local 00594	Moncton, N.B.	G. CALLENDAR
Local 00631	Montréal, Qué.	W. BOYCHUCK
Local 00692	Burnaby, B.C.	R. BIGGAR
Local 00692	Burnaby, B.C.	B. BROWN
Local 00692	Burnaby, B.C.	H. SPANCERS
Local 00712	Montréal, Qué.	N. CHERRY
Local 00712	Montréal, Qué.	M. CLERMONT
Local 00712	Montréal, Qué.	R. VALERIO
Local 00756	London, Ont.	C. FORDYCE
Local 00764	Richmond, B.C.	J. QUINN
Local 00869	Lachine, Qué.	E. GIRARD
Local 00901	Scarborough, Ont.	B. WALKER
Local 00922	Rock-Forest, Qué.	P. DAIGLE
Local 00962	St-Laurent, Qué.	J.P. ASSAFF
Local 01105	Brantford, Ont.	W. BORCHENKO
Local 01006	St-Laurent, Qué.	M. STE-MARIE
Local 01120	Thunder Bay, Ont.	F. HIMESHAZI
Local 01148	L'Assomption, Qué.	R. CODERRE
Loca' 01250	Lower Sackville, N.S.	N. KEMP
Local 01252	Downsview, Ont.	D. DEVEREUX
Local 01257	Don Mills, Ont.	T. TOTOK
Local 01295	Mississauga, Ont.	K. McCULLOCH
Local 01579	Edmonton, Alta.	H. McKIM
Local 01660	Lachine, Qué.	M. LABELLE
Local 01673	Brantford, Ont.	D. HOUSTON
Local 01681	Calgary, Alta.	C. ANDERSON
Local 01751	St-Laurent, Qué.	G. GUERRA
Local 01751	St-Laurent, Qué.	B. PAXTON
Local 01751	St-Laurent, Qué.	G. PERRIN
Local 01751	St-Laurent, Qué.	W.F. WATSON
Local 01755	Scarborough, Ont.	T. LEE
Local 01758	Montréal, Qué.	S. BUGWONDEEN
Local 01805	Cobourg, Ont.	D. WILLIAMS
Local 01823	Norval, Ont.	J. GOODISON
Local 01848	Flin Flon, Man.	P. MADARASH
Local 01863	Goderich, Ont.	C. RODGER
Local 01922	Mississauga, Ont.	J. HANAFIN
Local 01927	Stratford, Ont.	P.W. MacDONALD
Local 02113	Markham, Ont.	J. AITON
Local 02113	Markham, Ont.	J. GEDZ
Local 02183	St. Thomas, Ont.	D. SMITH
Local 02235	Montréal, Qué.	A. LIBERATORE
Local 02281	Oakville, Ont.	J. BUCKNALL
Local 02323	Mississauga, Ont.	D. WALKER
Local 02323	Mississauga, Ont.	R. WHITLOW
Local 02468	Lachine, Qué.	L. CAPPADOCIA
Local 02603	Winnipeg, Man.	S. CROW
Local 02727	St-Laurent, Qué.	J. PELLETIER
Local 02738	St-Laurent, Qué.	B. SMALL

International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union
Union internationale des ouvriers du vêtement pour dames

Local 00014	Toronto, Ont.	A. DAGG
Local 00014	Toronto, Ont.	H. STEWART
Local 00083	Toronto, Ont.	T. ABRAHAMS
Local 00092	Toronto, Ont.	W.A. VILLANO
Local 00112	Montréal, Qué.	L. AUCLAIR
Local 00205	Montréal, Qué.	J. FALCON
Local 00207	Montréal, Qué.	G. ROY
Local 00245	Montréal, Qué.	C. COTE
Local 00262	Montréal, Qué.	M. TROTTIER
Local 00286	Winnipeg, Man.	L. SPILLETT
Local 00287	Vancouver, B.C.	M. HILL
Local 00288	Winnipeg, Man.	J. SANTOS
Local 00439	Montréal, Qué.	L. VAILLANCOURT
Local 00485	Montréal, Qué.	M. MERCIER
Local 00568	Edmonton, Alta.	N. RESTORICK

International Leather Goods, Plastics and Novelty Workers' Union
Union internationale des ouvriers du cuir, plastique et nouveautés

Local 00008	Toronto, Ont.	A. SARTORELLI

International Longshoremen's Association
Association internationale des débardeurs

Local 00269	Halifax, N.S.	M.J. PROUDE
Local 01341	Dartmouth, N.S.	R.E. ROBINSON
Local 01825	Dartmouth, N.S.	R. COGHLIN
Local 01846	New York, N.Y.	G.J. McGINNIS

International Moulders' and Allied Workers' Union
Union internationale des mouleurs et travailleurs associés

Local 00028	Toronto, Ont.	N. DANIEL
Local 00029	Brantford, Ont.	B. GREEN
Local 00049	London, Ont.	E. MARSH
Local 00093	Wallaceburg, Ont.	J. LEACH
Local 00194	Cambridge, Ont.	E. LEE
Local 00246	London, Ont.	J. ERSKINE
Local 00360	Calgary, Alta.	R. BRIGGS
Local 00428	Toronto, Ont.	A. NAPLES
Local 00456	Toronto, Ont.	A. GABBIDON
Local 01680	Windsor, Ont.	R. KOUAL

International Typographical Union
Union typographique internationale

Local 00036	Calgary, Alta.	L.M. RUFO
Local 00038	Winnipeg, Man.	C. ROSNER
Local 00091	Toronto, Ont.	D.W. GREY
Local 00226	Vancouver, B.C.	V.J. LANGAN

International Woodworkers of America
Syndicat international des travailleurs du bois d'Amérique

Local 00001-71	Vancouver, B.C.	V. LEDGER
Local 00001-80	Duncan, B.C.	K. JOHNSON
Local 00001-85	Port Alberni, B.C.	M. KOKURA
Local 00001-85	Port Alberni, B.C.	H. NEDERGARD
Local 00001-207	Edmonton, Alta.	R. BLANCHARD
Local 00001-217	Vancouver, B.C.	T. BROWN
Local 00001-217	Vancouver, B.C.	G. KOBAYASHI
Local 00001-217	Langley, B.C.	L. PONA
Local 00001-217	Vancouver, B.C.	M. RASMUSSEN
Local 00001-357	New Westminster, B.C.	E. DUBAS
Local 00001-357	New Westminster, B.C.	J. LECLAIR
Local 00001-357	New Westminster, B.C.	R. McMILLAN
Local 00001-357	New Westminster, B.C.	T.B. SMITH
Local 00001-367	Maple Ridge, B.C.	S. GHAG
Local 00001-367	Maple Ridge, B.C.	D. TONES
Local 00001-405	Cranbrook, B.C.	B. BUTLER-HENDERSON
Local 00001-423	Kelowna, B.C.	T. FAWKES

Ironworkers of British Columbia

Local 00097	Vancouver, B.C.	G. SHORT

Letter Carriers' Union of Canada
Union des Facteurs du Canada

Local 00001	Toronto, Ont.	N. POMFRET
Local 00002	Ottawa, Ont.	H. FLING
Local 00003	Hamilton, Ont.	V. PRINCIPI
Local 00004	London, Ont.	L.D. McMAHON
Local 00005	Québec, Qué.	G. MERCER
Local 00006	Saint John, N.B.	G. LOWE
Local 00007	Winnipeg, Man.	L. NAULT
Local 00008	Kingston, Ont.	I. GERALD
Local 00009	Armdale, N.S.	S. RYAN
Local 00010	Montréal, Qué.	A. WILSON
Local 00011	Victoria, B.C.	W. GORDON
Local 00012	Vancouver, B.C.	E. LE HINGRAT
Local 00012	Vancouver, B.C.	C. WALSH
Local 00013	Brantford, Ont.	M. MUTCH
Local 00014	Calgary, Alta.	R. FERGUSON
Local 00015	Edmonton, Alta.	B. DONALDSON
Local 00016	Windsor, Ont.	J. DAVID
Local 00017	St. Catharines, Ont.	A. GODIN
Local 00018	Guelph, Ont.	D. FORTUNE
Local 00020	Kitchener, Ont.	G. LORENTZ
Local 00021	Brandon, Man.	D. FLICK
Local 00023	London, Ont.	G. RAMEAU
Local 00024	Thunder Bay, Ont.	P. RAPINDA
Local 00025	Sherbrooke, Qué.	A. BOISVERT
Local 00026	Moncton, N.B.	R. HYSLOP
Local 00029	Windsor, Ont.	J. BOYNTON

Local 00030	Regina, Sask.	D. CZEMERES
Local 00031	Windsor, Ont.	W. DESMARAIS
Local 00032	Burnaby, B.C.	J. VRECKO
Local 00035	Saskatoon, Sask.	R.G. McBAIN
Local 00037	Sydney, N.S.	J.S. MacDONALD
Local 00038	Calgary, Alta.	N. NEELANDS
Local 00041	Medicine Hat, Alta.	E. HAMLIN
Local 00041	Medicine Hat, Alta.	R. SMITH
Local 00042	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	P. DENLEY
Local 00047	Trois-Rivières, Qué.	B. YORKE
Local 00048	Woodstock, Ont.	M. WILLIAMS
Local 00049	Willowdale, Ont.	T. PARKES
Local 00052	Shawinigan, Qué.	F. BRANDSMA
Local 00053	Oshawa, Ont.	P. DUNN
Local 00054	Nanaimo, B.C.	W.D. STEELE
Local 00055	North Bay, Ont.	D. COLLINS
Local 00057	Welland, Ont.	M.A. HACHEY
Local 00058	Ottawa, Ont.	J. CARRIER
Local 00060	Yorkton, Sask.	C. MacKENZIE
Local 00061	Sudbury, Ont.	O. CLOUTHIER
Local 00063	Orillia, Ont.	J. SMALLWOOD
Local 00065	St-Hyacinthe, Qué.	R. MESSIER
Local 00068	Chicoutimi, Qué.	G. CHAPADEAU
Local 00069	Cornwall, Ont.	T. BOURGON
Local 00072	St-Charles Borromée, Qué.	G. MALO
Local 00073	Cap-de-la-Madeleine, Qué.	W. BROWN
Local 00074	Kirkland Lake, Ont.	T. GAUTHIER
Local 00075	Nelson, B.C.	J. PARKES
Local 00076	Trail, B.C.	N. PEACHEY
Local 00077	Timmins, Ont.	G. MARCOUX
Local 00079	New Glasgow, N.S.	F. CAMPBELL
Local 00080	Kamloops, B.C.	E. BIFANO
Local 00081	St-Jérôme, Qué.	R. TRAVERSY
Local 00082	Kenora, Ont.	P. CREED
Local 00087	Chicoutimi N., Qué.	V.T. ASTORIA
Local 00088	Victoriaville, Qué.	L. BERGERON
Local 00096	Windsor, Ont.	J. TROTTER Jr
Local 00100	Port Alberni, B.C.	L. WEBSTER
Local 00101	Wallaceburg, Ont.	C. HILL
Local 00102	Vernon, B.C.	G. MILLER
Local 00103	Fort Frances, Ont.	R. COLE
Local 00105	Brampton, Ont.	A. FENDLEY
Local 00105	Brampton, Ont.	L. POUW
Local 00109	St. John's, Nfld.	G. SHEEHAN
Local 00110	Chilliwack, B.C.	H. JOHNSON
Local 00114	Thorold, Ont.	R. WOLSKI
Local 00116	Kentville, N.S.	G. MORRISSETTE
Local 00120	Grand-Mère, Qué.	L. YORKE
Local 00122	Waterloo, Ont.	E. BLACK
Local 00123	Portage La Prairie, Man.	D. BELROSE
Local 00125	Flin Flon, Man.	F. QUIGLEY

Local 00127	Prince George, B.C.	J. HORSLEY
Local 00128	Brampton, Ont.	J. ARNOLD
Local 00129	Yarmouth, N.S.	M. ROBERT
Local 00130	Val d'Or, Qué.	J.C. MINIER
Local 00133	White Rock, B.C.	S. SCOTT
Local 00137	Lachute, Qué.	R. BEGIN
Local 00147	Pierrefonds, Qué.	S. COUTURE
Local 00151	Elliot Lake, Ont.	T. BARBEAU
Local 00152	Stoney Creek, Ont.	G. LENNAX
Local 00155	Grande Prairie, Alta.	L.L. BOYD
Local 00160	London, Ont.	J.W. HORNER
Local 00163	Hamilton, Ont.	S. LEMIEUX
Local 00165	Kapuskasing, Ont.	P. TAYLOR
Local 00167	Mississauga, Ont.	C. WYNTER
Local 00168	Burlington, Ont.	L. TEW
Local 00169	Dartmouth, N.S.	D. GLENNIE
Local 00173	Dauphin, Man.	B. PILLING
Local 00177	London, Ont.	P. REIDY
Local 00179	Mississauga, Ont.	V. ORETO
Local 00183	Loretteville, Qué.	J. DESJARDINS
Local 00186	London, Ont.	F. LASEK
Local 00187	Baie Comeau, Qué.	G. DEARS
Local 00188	Weyburn, Sask.	J. CROWELL
Local 00189	Estevan, Sask.	L. BUE
Local 00193	Rouyn, Qué.	D. LAPERLE
Local 00198	Winnipeg, Man.	R. DAVIS
Local 00199	Kelowna, B.C.	K.W. CONLIN
Local 00201	Cranbrook, B.C.	M. MOODY
Local 00202	Kimberley, B.C.	J. TRIPP
Local 00206	Camrose, Alta.	B. WILSON
Local 00208	Duncan, B.C.	N. GOLINOWSKI
Local 00210	Hamilton, Ont.	N. SMITH
Local 00213	Hauterive, Qué.	W. JOHNSON
Local 00215	Winnipeg, Man.	B. BUGARA
Local 00218	Surrey, B.C.	C. TASCHUK
Local 00219	Pickering, Ont.	H. SELBY
Local 00221	Dryden, Ont.	J. HEPPELLE
Local 00223	Amos, Qué.	W. LOMBARDO
Local 00224	Roberval, Qué.	M. BERNIER
Local 00225	St-Agathe-des-Monts, Qué.	L.D. O'HARA
Local 00227	La Baie, Qué.	B. CAULFIELD
Local 00233	North Battleford, Sask.	G. McMASTER
Local 00242	Windsor, Ont.	J. ERDELY
Local 00243	Courtenay, B.C.	J.D. PERREAULT
Local 00245	Bridgewater, N.S.	S. ELLIS
Local 00246	Mont-Laurier, Qué.	R. LISINSKI
Local 00249	London, Ont.	G. DENNIS
Local 00250	Stephenville, Nfld.	M. VILLEMAIRE
Local 00251	Gander, Nfld.	R. ROYSTON
Local 00255	Hanover, Ont.	S. THOMAS
Local 00256	White Rock, B.C.	K. DOUBT

Local 00257	Mount Pearl, Nfld.	R.C. HAMILTON
Local 00259	Quesnel, B.C.	B.L. OXENBURY
Local 00264	Mission, B.C.	R. ANDRUS
Local 00267	Napanee, Ont.	D. THOMPSON
Local 00268	Windsor, Ont.	T. GIRARD
Local 00269	Fort St. John, B.C.	B.J. NELSON
Local 00270	Delta, B.C.	P. BOURGET
Local 00271	La Sarre, Qué.	B. FAWCETT
Local 00273	Wetaskiwin, Alta.	W. MERCER
Local 00276	Fort McMurray, Alta.	D. GABRIEL
Local 00278	Dolbeau, Qué.	B. HAMMOND
Local 00283	Port Cartier, Qué.	B. REIDY
Local 00284	Ottawa, Ont.	D. DELLEPALME
Local 00285	Windsor, Ont.	J. O'NEILL
Local 00286	Islington, Ont.	G.C. MacKENZIE
Local 00287	Sherwood Park, Alta.	B. BENSON
Local 00288	Scarborough, Ont.	A. KRAYCHUCK

Marine Worker's Federation
Fédération des travailleurs
de construction navale

Local 00001	Halifax, N.S.	L. HOLLOWAY
Local 00003	Saint John, N.B.	G.E. MARR
Local 00006	Saint John, N.B.	C.E. MacDONALD
Local 00020	Marystown, Nfld	L.E. WALSH
Local 00031	Saint John, N.B.	J. McLEOD

Maritime Fishermen's Union
Union des pêcheurs des Maritimes

Local 00013	Porters Lake, N.S.	C.B. COVEY

Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers
and Helpers' International Union
Syndicat international des
polisseurs de métal, plaqueurs

Local 00019	Scarborough, Ont.	B. GOMES

National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians
Association nationale des employés et techniciens en radiodiffusion

Local 00072	Willowdale, Ont.	W. SAUNDERS
Local 00079	Willowdale, Ont.	G.C. CLEMENTS
Local 00700	Toronto, Ont.	M. OSTROFF
Local 00914	Sydney, N.S.	F. CORBETT

NATIONAL UNION OF PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
SYNDICAT NATIONAL DE LA FONCTION PUBLIQUE PROVINCIALE

Alberta Union of Provincial Employees
Syndicat de la Fonction publique de l'Alberta

Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	D. ANDERSON
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	C. ARNOLD
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	P. BROST
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	D. BUXTON

Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	C. COOK
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	H. DHILLON
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	L. ELLIS
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	D. GORDON
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	B. HORNUNG
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	K. KADYK
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	M. KAUN
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	L. KOZAKIWICH
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	B. KUZIO
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	F. MARTIN
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	J. McGATHAN
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	A. NIKOLAI
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	S. OSGOODE
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	L. PALMATEER
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	W. PAQUETTE
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	H. REDFORD
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	K. LILLY
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	K. THAKUR
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	M. THISTLE
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	J.P. VOYER
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	J. WILK
Local 00001	Edmonton, Alta.	P. WOCKNITZ
Local 00002	Edmonton, Alta.	C. JOHNSON
Local 00002	Edmonton, Alta.	C. KHEHRA
Local 00002	Edmonton, Alta.	D. SWANT
Local 00002	Edmonton, Alta.	C. WODAK
Local 00003	Edmonton, Alta.	B. McLELLAN
Local 00004	Edmonton, Alta.	M. DONALD
Local 00005	Edmonton, Alta.	C. ROSE
Local 00006	Edmonton, Alta.	S. BUTLER
Local 00008	Edmonton, Alta.	M. POULTER
Local 00009	Edmonton, Alta.	M. GRAIG
Local 00009	Edmonton, Alta.	M. NELSON
Local 00010	Edmonton, Alta.	E. GALENZA
Local 00011	Edmonton, Alta.	J. BOOTH
Local 00011	Edmonton, Alta.	H. CHRISTENSEN
Local 00011	Edmonton, Alta.	S. WILK
Local 00012	Edmonton, Alta.	C. LABERGE
Local 00012	Edmonton, Alta.	W. RAICHEL
Local 00012	Edmonton, Alta.	W. WILLAMS
Local 00038	Edmonton, Alta.	D. HOLLAND
Local 00050	Edmonton, Alta.	T. KOZICKY
Local 00050	Edmonton, Alta.	H. WOOLEY
Local 00052	Edmonton, Alta.	M. NOWAKOWSKI
Local 00052	Edmonton, Alta.	C. PELLETIER
Local 00053	Edmonton, Alta.	L. NEWMAN
Local 00054	Edmonton, Alta.	C.A. DEAN
Local 00057	Edmonton, Alta.	W. FLEMING
Local 00059	Edmonton, Alta.	M. LYSTER
Local 00100	Edmonton, Alta.	E. ANDERSON

Brewery Malt and Soft Drink Workers, Local 304
Travailleurs de brasseries, de malt et
de boissons gazeuses, section locale 304

Local 00304	Toronto, Ont.	A. CARROLL
Local 00304	Toronto, Ont.	J. GILL
Local 00304	Toronto, Ont.	J. McNAMEE
Local 00304	Toronto, Ont.	C. NELSON

British Columbia Government Employees' Union
Syndicat des fonctionnaires provinciaux de la Colombie-Britannique

Local 00100	Burnaby, B.C.	L. ARSENAULT
Local 00104	Burnaby, B.C.	D. WIGHT
Local 00203	Burnaby, B.C.	L. AHEARN
Local 00203	Burnaby, B.C.	D. ISHIKAWA
Local 00304	Burnaby, B.C.	G. MOWATT
Local 00501	Burnaby, B.C.	E. VOSSENAAR
Local 00502	Burnaby, B.C.	R. LANIGAN
Local 00503	Burnaby, B.C.	J. FOX
Local 00504	Burnaby, B.C.	B. JONES
Local 00505	Burnaby, B.C.	N. NUPLISSIE
Local 00507	Burnaby, B.C.	R. RUTHERFORD
Local 00508	Burnaby, B.C.	R. SARICH
Local 00601	Burnaby, B.C.	J. SHIELDS
Local 00602	Burnaby, B.C.	L. RUSSELL
Local 00605	Burnaby, B.C.	J. COWELL
Local 00606	Burnaby, B.C.	R. WILLIAMS
Local 00608	Burnaby, B.C.	Z. MacDONALD
Local 00801	Burnaby, B.C.	E. CULL
Local 00803	Burnaby, B.C.	J. VAN HAASTREGT
Local 00805	Burnaby, B.C.	B. BEUGELING
Local 00812	Burnaby, B.C.	G. HEYMAN
Local 01004	Burnaby, B.C.	J. ELCOATE
Local 01005	Burnaby, B.C.	B. HAGENBUCK
Local 01008	Burnaby, B.C.	R. BRANDEN
Local 01009	Burnaby, B.C.	B. TAYLOR
Local 01011	Burnaby, B.C.	L. PATTIE
Local 01012	Burnaby, B.C.	I. GARNIE
Local 01101	Burnaby, B.C.	A. USTIK
Local 01102	Burnaby, B.C.	R. LEECH
Local 01109	Burnaby, B.C.	R. CHERBO
Local 01201	Burnaby, B.C.	C. TOCHER
Local 01202	Burnaby, B.C.	M. LINN
Local 01203	Burnaby, B.C.	J. BELIAK
Local 01203	Burnaby, B.C.	E. BELLAMORE
Local 01203	Burnaby, B.C.	L. FANTHORPE
Local 01204	Burnaby, B.C.	K. RICHARDSON
Local 01205	Burnaby, B.C.	D. BIRD
Local 01206	Burnaby, B.C.	D. GUINN
Local 01207	Burnaby, B.C.	W. SCOTT
Local 01208	Burnaby, B.C.	M. LAING
Local 01209	Burnaby, B.C.	J. BARDOS
Local 01210	Burnaby, B.C.	P. SANDERSON

Local 01211	Burnaby, B.C.	L. KIDD
Local 01211	Burnaby, B.C.	D. W00D
Local 01452	Burnaby, B.C.	T. FLETCHER
Local 01456	Burnaby, B.C.	T. KOZAR
Local 01457	Burnaby, B.C.	L. STONE
Local 01459	Burnaby, B.C.	J. BAINBRIDGE
Local 01466	Burnaby, B.C.	J. FOX
Local 01468	Burnaby, B.C.	S. SANDERSON
Local 01472	Burnaby, B.C.	G. REAMSBOTTOM
Local 01473	Burnaby, B.C.	J. MacPHAIL
Local 01474	Burnaby, B.C.	F. WHITE
Local 01475	Burnaby, B.C.	P. DICKSON
Local 01476	Burnaby, B.C.	M. ERHARDT
Local 01602	Burnaby, B.C.	S. DENNETT
Ferry Workers	Victoria, B.C.	D. ROWE
Ferry Workers	N. Vancouver, B.C.	L. THORNHILL
Brewery	Burnaby, B.C.	R. SUTHERLAND

Canadian Union of Brewery and General Workers, Local 325
Syndicat canadien des travailleurs de brasseries et travailleurs en général, section locale 325

Local 00325	Ottawa, Ont.	G. GRECO

Manitoba Government Employees' Association
Association de la Fonction publique du Manitoba

Local 00104	Winnipeg, Man.	G. MURKIN
Local 00106	Winnipeg, Man.	D. HOLMES
Local 00107	Winnipeg, Man.	A. MALONEY
Local 00107	Winnipeg, Man.	P. OLFERT
Local 00108	Winnipeg, Man.	B. VAIL
Local 00201	Winnipeg, Man.	C. BUTLER
Local 00203	Winnipeg, Man.	C. BERTHOLET
Local 00206	Winnipeg, Man.	R. BURNS
Local 00207	Winnipeg, Man.	T. BLEASDALE
Local 00302	Winnipeg, Man.	B. ANDERSON
Local 00303	Winnipeg, Man.	W. ANDON
Local 00303	Winnipeg, Man.	S. McKENZIE
Local 00306	Winnipeg, Man.	R. GIBBS
Local 00307	Winnipeg, Man.	C. CARLUCCI
Local 00403	Winnipeg, Man.	J. HOLOD
Local 00406	Winnipeg, Man.	M. DAY
Local 00503	Winnipeg, Man.	E. WATT
Local 00507	Winnipeg, Man.	D. WIGMORE
Local 00508	Winnipeg, Man.	J. ROBINSON
Local 00701	Winnipeg, Man.	B. FRYKAS
Local 00707	Winnipeg, Man.	R. HABKIRK
Local 00803	Winnipeg, Man.	J. BUCHANNON
Local 00803	Winnipeg, Man.	D. SMITH
Local 00803	Winnipeg, Man.	D. TAYLOR
Local 00803	Winnipeg, Man.	T. WATTS

Local 00804	Winnipeg, Man.	J. ARNOTT
Local 00805	Winnipeg, Man.	J. BARBOUR
Local 00805	Winnipeg, Man.	R. CARMICHAEL
Local 00806	Winnipeg, Man.	A. TRUDEAU
Local 00807	Winnipeg, Man.	R. FRISKEN
Local 00807	Winnipeg, Man.	R.S. OLIEN
Local 00807	Winnipeg, Man.	R. PROCTOR
Local 00807	Winnipeg, Man.	J.E. PULLEN
Local 00902	Winnipeg, Man.	S. ROZNOWSKY
Local 00908	Winnipeg, Man.	D. KILBOYLE
Local 00908	Winnipeg, Man.	D. FIDERCHUK
Local 01003	Winnipeg, Man.	D. FEHILLY
Local 01003	Winnipeg, Man.	B. EDWARDS
Local 01405	Winnipeg, Man.	E. DUBRAY
Local 02307	Winnipeg, Man.	A. DEMONG

Newfoundland Association of Public Employees
Association de la Fonction publique de Terre-Neuve

Local 01401	St. John's, Nfld.	R. HUSSEY
Local 01404	St. John's, Nfld.	E. SEWARD
Local 01501	St. John's, Nfld.	W. WHITE
Local 01801	St. John's, Nfld.	T. O'CONNELL
Local 02101	St. John's, Nfld.	J. HICKMAN
Local 02202	St. John's, Nfld.	D. FUDGE
Local 03403	St. John's, Nfld.	F. MARCH
Local 03601	St. John's, Nfld.	C.A. BESON
Local 04208	St. John's, Nfld.	K. HOYLES
Local 05202	St. John's, Nfld.	C. REYNOLDS
Local 06202	St. John's, Nfld.	S. TIZZARD
Local 06205	St. John's, Nfld.	A. CHAPLIN
Local 06206	St. John's, Nfld.	R. MORRIS
Local 06601	St. John's, Nfld.	A. DEIR
Local 06602	St. John's, Nfld.	E. HOGAN
Local 06901	St. John's, Nfld.	M. FLEMING
Local 07001	St. John's, Nfld.	D. CURTIS
Local 07002	St. John's, Nfld.	B. EVANS
Local 07003	St. John's, Nfld.	B. PITCHER
Local 07004	St. John's, Nfld.	D. BYRNE
Local 07101	St. John's, Nfld.	S. PERRY
Local 07103	St. John's, Nfld.	L. PUDDESTER
Local 07107	St. John's, Nfld.	S. BECKWITH
Local 07302	St. John's, Nfld.	A. DODGE
Local 07401	St. John's, Nfld.	J. BROWNE
Local 07404	St. John's, Nfld.	P. IVANY
Local 07501	St. John's, Nfld.	R. ST. CROIX
Local 07701	St. John's, Nfld.	P. MYERS
Local 07805	St. John's, Nfld.	J. KEATS
Local 07808	St. John's, Nfld.	S. PATTEN
Local 07809	St. John's, Nfld.	D. WHALEN
Local 08601	St. John's, Nfld.	G. WARD

Local 09202	St. John's, Nfld.	W. ROWSELL
Local 09204	St. John's, Nfld.	G. MURPHY

Nova Scotia Government Employees' Union
Syndicat de la Fonction publique de la Nouvelle-Écosse

Local 00001	Halifax, N.S.	M. BANCKS
Local 00004	Halifax, N.S.	J. BACICH
Local 00005	Halifax, N.S.	A. TIMMONS
Local 00007	Halifax, N.S.	V. HENRIKSON
Local 00010	Halifax, N.S.	J. MacMILLAN
Local 00012	Halifax, N.S.	M. WEXLER
Local 00013	Halifax, N.S.	G. WOLFE
Local 00014	Halifax, N.S.	J. RYAN
Local 00015	Halifax, N.S.	G. BLANCHARD
Local 00016	Halifax, N.S.	D. BALKAN
Local 00017	Halifax, N.S.	H. STEIN
Local 00018	Halifax, N.S.	N. ROBAR
Local 00019	Halifax, N.S.	J. CHAFE
Local 00020	Halifax, N.S.	L. SINGLER
Local 00021	Halifax, N.S.	D. SIMMONS
Local 00362	Halifax, N.S.	W. COMEAU
Local 00470	Halifax, N.S.	G. PARKER
Local 00701	Halifax, N.S.	G. GORMLEY

Ontario Liquor Boards Employees' Union
Syndicat des employés de la Régie des alcools de l'Ontario

Local 00001	Mississauga, Ont.	R. DUBOIS
Local 00004	Mississauga, Ont.	C. RESTORICK
Local 00005	Mississauga, Ont.	M. SULLIVAN
Local 00006	Mississauga, Ont.	A. EDMUNDS
Local 00007	Mississauga, Ont.	R. KEMPE
Local 00008	Mississauga, Ont.	J. MILES
Local 00009	Mississauga, Ont.	H. NIELSEN
Local 00010	Mississauga, Ont.	A. SIMPSON
Local 00011	Mississauga, Ont.	B. ROBERTSON
Local 00012	Mississauga, Ont.	D. MacKINNON
Local 00013	Mississauga, Ont.	L. CURRIER
Local 00014	Mississauga, Ont.	F. LENTO
Local 00017	Mississauga, Ont.	J. GATT
Local 00018	Mississauga, Ont.	D. JUNKIN
Local 00020	Mississauga, Ont.	B. HOPKINSON
Local 00022	Mississauga, Ont.	M. LEESE
Local 00024	Mississauga, Ont.	W. MALKIEWICH
Local 00026	Mississauga, Ont.	K. CLARKE

Ontario Public Service Employees' Union
Syndicat des employés de la Fonction publique de l'Ontario

Local 00101	Toronto, Ont.	E.G. McTAGGART
Local 00104	Toronto, Ont.	J.W. OPPER
Local 00105	Toronto, Ont.	E. KUNKA
Local 00110	London, Ont.	P. MUSSON

Local 00114	Toronto, Ont.	A.G. WARREN
Local 00116	Toronto, Ont.	G.P. BAYNE
Local 00117	Toronto, Ont.	A.W. CZEKIERDA
Local 00122	Toronto, Ont.	R.H. JACKSON
Local 00126	Toronto, Ont.	B. VAN LOON
Local 00130	Toronto, Ont.	B. PARKER
Local 00133	Toronto, Ont.	D.J. MONTGOMERY
Local 00134	Toronto, Ont.	E. McGRAW
Local 00135	Toronto, Ont.	M.A. JONES
Local 00136	Toronto, Ont.	R. ANWYLL
Local 00137	Toronto, Ont.	J. PFLANZNER
Local 00201	Toronto, Ont.	F. BRINKMAN
Local 00203	Toronto, Ont.	L. TAYLOR
Local 00213	Toronto, Ont.	L.M. CASSELMAN
Local 00214	Toronto, Ont.	V. VADACCHINO
Local 00218	Toronto, Ont.	V.A. VINERSKIS
Local 00224	Toronto, Ont.	P. IETSWAARD
Local 00228	Toronto, Ont.	A. LOCHHEAD
Local 00230	Toronto, Ont.	S. ARMSTRONG
Local 00238	Toronto, Ont.	K. GENNINGS
Local 00241	Toronto, Ont.	N. MOONEY
Local 00244	Toronto, Ont.	R.J. MARTIN
Local 00246	Toronto, Ont.	G. HAMILTON
Local 00248	Toronto, Ont.	T. LITTLE
Local 00251	Toronto, Ont.	T. ELLIOTT
Local 00301	Toronto, Ont.	J.C. HOLMAN
Local 00302	Toronto, Ont.	W.R. SHRED
Local 00305	Toronto, Ont.	F. UPSHAW
Local 00306	Toronto, Ont.	E. LAVALLEY
Local 00314	Toronto, Ont.	R.H. EDDINGTON
Local 00323	Toronto, Ont.	B.R. DOYLE
Local 00331	Toronto, Ont.	J.A. GATES
Local 00332	Toronto, Ont.	J.K. THIBEAU
Local 00333	Toronto, Ont.	S.T. WILSON
Local 00336	Toronto, Ont.	P. SMITH
Local 00337	Toronto, Ont.	D. LLOYD
Local 00338	Toronto, Ont.	L. ROCK
Local 00339	Toronto, Ont.	D. JULIAN
Local 00345	Toronto, Ont.	M. ELMHIRST
Local 00403	Toronto, Ont.	E. THOMSEN
Local 00413	Toronto, Ont.	J.E. BENARD
Local 00415	Toronto, Ont.	B. LEAHY
Local 00428	Toronto, Ont.	N. TAYLOR
Local 00431	Toronto, Ont.	C. LOCKWOOD
Local 00432	Toronto, Ont.	B. MILLER
Local 00434	Toronto, Ont.	W.R. CRAIG
Local 00436	Toronto, Ont.	M. NOON
Local 00439	Toronto, Ont.	A. LANE
Local 00449	Toronto, Ont.	B. PATRICK
Local 00453	Toronto, Ont.	T. ROSE
Local 00454	Toronto, Ont.	S. MURRAY

Local 00456	Toronto, Ont.	G. WEBSTER
Local 00465	Toronto, Ont.	B. TRENTADUE
Local 00505	Toronto, Ont.	H.M. MacNEIL
Local 00509	Toronto, Ont.	G.B. HENDERSON
Local 00511	Toronto, Ont.	S.E. JOHNSTON
Local 00519	Toronto, Ont.	P. LEE
Local 00520	Toronto, Ont.	D.A. BALL
Local 00525	Toronto, Ont.	I. PETERS
Local 00526	Toronto, Ont.	S.R. STYLIANOS
Local 00528	Toronto, Ont.	D.W. SANGSTER
Local 00530	Toronto, Ont.	K. WILSON
Local 00532	Toronto, Ont.	J.C. GULBIS
Local 00542	Toronto, Ont.	S. SIKAND
Local 00560	Toronto, Ont.	T. MONTGOMERY
Local 00561	Thornhill, Ont.	B. EGRI
Local 00561	Toronto, Ont.	S. VALLANCE
Local 00562	Toronto, Ont.	J. HUOT
Local 00563	Toronto, Ont.	B.L. WALL
Local 00579	Toronto, Ont.	P. DE POE
Local 00586	Toronto, Ont.	J.A. CLANCY
Local 00595	Toronto, Ont.	B. WEISLEDER
Local 00601	Toronto, Ont.	B. McPHEE
Local 00625	Toronto, Ont.	W. CAMPBELL
Local 00630	Sudbury, Ont.	K. LOVELY
Local 00633	Toronto, Ont.	W. PRESLEY
Local 00635	Toronto, Ont.	F. RICK
Local 00636	Toronto, Ont.	G.J. ROWE
Local 00640	Toronto, Ont.	W.P. EATON
Local 00644	Toronto, Ont.	J. JOHNSON
Local 00649	Toronto, Ont.	F. NICE
Local 00652	Toronto, Ont.	Y. CLOUTIER
Local 00654	Toronto, Ont.	P.J. SELECKY
Local 00655	Toronto, Ont.	B. KUEHNBAUM
Local 00657	Toronto, Ont.	A.J. DUPUIS
Local 00664	Toronto, Ont.	R. VILLENEUVE
Local 00667	Toronto, Ont.	L. STEWART
Local 00702	Toronto, Ont.	R. BERGMAN
Local 00703	Toronto, Ont.	T.J. CARROLL
Local 00704	Toronto, Ont.	N.C. ROSZELL
Local 00708	Toronto, Ont.	T.A. CONNOLLY
Local 00712	Toronto, Ont.	J.B. ARMSTRONG
Local 00713	Toronto, Ont.	B.A. COOMBS
Local 00715	Toronto, Ont.	A.R. STEAD
Local 00718	Toronto, Ont.	L.G. HUPET
Local 00719	Toronto, Ont.	D.C. GROPP
Local 00720	Toronto, Ont.	M. VEZINA
Local 00721	Toronto, Ont.	B.H. RICHMOND
Local 00724	Toronto, Ont.	B. LATHAM
Local 00731	Toronto, Ont.	A.M. RYDER
Local 00732	Toronto, Ont.	J.R. O'DONNELL

Prince Edward Island Union of Public Sector Employees
Syndicat de la Fonction publique de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard

Local 00001	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	C. WOLOSKI
Local 00002	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	C. DAVIS
Local 00004	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	B. MORIARITY
Local 00008	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	S. MacKAY
Local 00014	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	R. RYAN SABADA
Local 00015	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	H. MacDONALD
Local 00024	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	E. KELLY

Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union
Syndicat de la Fonction publique de la Saskatchewan

Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	R. AUGUST
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	J. BELL
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	F. BISHOP
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	B. BYERS
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	I. HENDRY
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	B. JACKSON
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	L. JACKSON
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	A. KOBIALKO
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	S. STRETTEN
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	E. WALKER
Local 00001	Regina, Sask.	M. WEBB
Local 00002	Regina, Sask.	N. HAZEN
Local 00002	Regina, Sask.	V. KAZAKOFF
Local 00002	Regina, Sask.	D. SWEET
Local 00003	Regina, Sask.	J. UNTERINER
Local 00004	Regina, Sask.	R. KACH
Local 00005	Regina, Sask.	T. McKNIGHT
Local 00005	Regina, Sask.	A. PARENTEAU
Local 00006	Regina, Sask.	B. JEANNOTTE
Local 00007	Regina, Sask.	E. FREY
Local 00008	Regina, Sask.	K. WARNER
Local 00009	Regina, Sask.	R. TATARYN
Local 00010	Regina, Sask.	R. HOBBS
Local 00011	Regina, Sask.	L. BROWN
Local 00012	Regina, Sask.	B. STEVENSON
Local 00014	Regina, Sask.	J. ZEMLUK
Local 00015	Regina, Sask.	S. WONITOWY
Local 00017	Regina, Sask.	J. MILLER
Local 00019	Regina, Sask.	F. POUPART
Local 00020	Regina, Sask.	B. ZIMMERMAN
Local 00021	Regina, Sask.	A. SCARFE
Local 00022	Regina, Sask.	J. McMILLEN
Local 00023	Regina, Sask.	W. WEBER
Local 00481	Regina, Sask.	D. HASSARD

Office and Professional Employees' International Union
Union internationale des employés professionnels et de bureau

Local 00026	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	M. KLYM
Local 00057	Montréal, Qué.	S. BERLIN

Local 00057	Montréal, Qué.	M. FILLION
Local 00057	Montréal, Qué.	C. GRENIER
Local 00057	Montréal, Qué.	D. LAFOREST
Local 00057	Montréal, Qué.	M. LAPLANTE
Local 00057	Montréal, Qué.	J. PAQUET
Local 00057	Montréal, Qué.	M. ROUSSEAU
Local 00161	Smooth Rock Falls, Ont.	R. THOMAS
Local 00166	Kapuskasing, Ont.	J. BEST
Local 00214	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	R. LORI
Local 00225	Ottawa, Ont.	S. WALLACE
Local 00236	Thunder Bay, Ont.	R. KARAM
Local 00282	Toronto, Ont.	K. MADDISON
Local 00343	Toronto, Ont.	P. CLANCY
Local 00347	Mississauga, Ont.	C. KIRBY
Local 00397	Regina, Sask.	J. SCHMIDT
Local 00418	Cornwall, Ont.	Y. DEMALPAS
Local 00434	Montréal, Qué.	Y.C. RIVARD
Local 00458	Edmonton, Alta.	J. SELBY
Local 00463	Montréal, Qué.	V. POSCA
Local 00468	London, Ont.	L. KERR
Local 00473	Toronto, Ont.	S. PATTERSON
Local 00491	Burnaby, B.C.	S. CAMMELL
Local 00520	Toronto, Ont.	R. KING
Local 00523	Kapuskasing, Ont.	J. GOLLEDGE

Ontario Federation of Construction

Local 00183	Toronto, Ont.	R. LOTITO
Local 00183	Toronto, Ont.	M.A. O'BRIEN
Local 00183	Toronto, Ont.	T. PINTO
Local 00183	Toronto, Ont.	M.J. REILLY
Local 00183	Toronto, Ont.	A. RODRIGUES
Local 00597	Whitby, Ont.	W. FAIRSERVICE
Local 00607	Thunder Bay, Ont.	P. LITTLE
Local 00721	Toronto, Ont.	A. MacISAAC
Local 00736	Hamilton, Ont.	L. ISAACS
Local 01036	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	J. LEWIS

PUBLIC SERVICE ALLIANCE OF CANADA
ALLIANCE DE LA FONCTION PUBLIQUE DU CANADA

Agriculture Union
Syndicat de l'Agriculture

Local 00002	Halifax, N.S.	J. RODGERSON
Local 00016	London, Ont.	G. ROCK
Local 00020	Regina, Sask.	F.E. WILSON
Local 00030	Ottawa, Ont.	N. BOWERS
Local 00033	Kitchener, Ont.	L.R. LENG
Local 00054	Swift Current, Sask.	F. LEWES
Local 00058	Nappan, Cumb. Co., N.S.	R. RIPLEY
Local 10011	Lennoxville, Qué.	A. VACHON
Local 10080	Beloeil, Qué.	A. SENECHAL
Local 10082	Pointe du Lac, Qué.	C.A. PARENT

Local 20044	Ottawa, Ont.	F.J. COATES
Local 30023	Edmonton, Alta.	L.D. MORTON
Local 30048	Ottawa, Ont.	R. MILLWARD
Local 40022	Saskatoon, Sask.	B.M. MAKEECHAK
Local 40052	Melfort, Sask.	K.A. WILLOUGHBY
Local 50057	Winnipeg, Man.	R. CAMPBELL
Local 70075	Ottawa, Ont.	H. DOCTER
Local 90004	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	N.H. VESSEY

Canada Employment and Immigration Union
Syndicat de l'Emploi et de l'Immigration du Canada

Local 00546	Toronto, Ont.	C. PASCUCCI
Local 00558	Toronto, Ont.	J. ANDERSEN
Local 00592	Kitchener, Ont.	D. HILLIER
Local 00618	Niagara Falls, Ont.	J. LABINE-LECLAIR
Local 00621	Ottawa, Ont.	B. KEREKES
Local 10424	Montréal, Qué.	N. TURMEL
Local 10432	Amos, Qué.	M. BELLEMARE
Local 10450	Charny, Qué.	C. LABONTE
Local 20901	Ottawa, Ont.	J. ABRAMOWICH
Local 20944	Vancouver, B.C.	A. WEST
Local 20966	Ottawa, Ont.	K. BOER
Local 40802	Saskatoon, Sask.	J.M. SMITH
Local 50756	Ottawa, Ont.	S. AUBERTIN
Local 50757	Winnipeg, Man.	P. TROTTIER
Local 70704	Hull, Qué.	H. SAX
Local 80216	Dartmouth, N.S.	E. BEATON
Local 80219	Dartmouth, N.S.	S. OSBORNE
Local 90114	Hr Grace, Nfld.	R.W. GILBERT
Local 90153	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	B.V. REILLY

Customs and Excise Union
Union Douanes Accise

Local 00018	Windsor, Ont.	J. CHAFE
Local 00024	Toronto, Ont.	A. ALMEIDAV
Local 10007	Montréal, Qué.	A. DOYON
Local 20040	Vancouver, B.C.	D.M. MONTGOMERY
Local 60004	Hartland, N.B.	G. BREWER

Department of Veterans' Affairs Component
Elément du ministère des Affaires des anciens combattants

Local 10007	Ste-Foy, Qué.	L. PEPIN
Local 50044	Winnipeg, Man.	S.G. FARLEY
Local 60006	Saint John, N.B.	S.L. MESSER

Environment Component
Elément de l'Environnement

Local 00709	Willowdale, Ont.	L. GUISE-PAGLEY
Local 20169	Victoria, B.C.	J. RUDD
Local 50135	Winnipeg, Man.	A.R. BEAL
Local 50707	Ottawa, Ont.	R. CARMAN

Local 60083	St. Andrews, N.B.	C.F. MONAGHAN
Local 70045	Chalk River, Ont.	D. HOELKE
Local 70742	Ottawa, Ont.	J. PACHOLIK
Local 80716	Bedford, N.S.	G. BLACKLOCK
Local 90001	St. John's, Nfld.	G. BROWNE
Local 90168	Charlottetown, P.E.I.	J. MACEWEN

National Component
Elément national

Local 00087	Toronto, Ont.	E. LUNN
Local 00137	Toronto, Ont.	M. WURSTA
Local 00298	Sioux Lookout, Ont.	D. CHALK
Local 10269	Ottawa, Ont.	A. LEMIRE
Local 10375	Montréal, Qué.	M. SENECAL
Local 50235	Ottawa, Ont.	S.J. MARUCA
Local 70027	Hull, Qué.	L. FARKAS
Local 70059	Ottawa, Ont.	W. JACKSON
Local 70059	Ottawa, Ont.	M. KANIGAN
Local 70059	Ottawa, Ont.	F. RENGER
Local 70101	Ottawa, Ont.	D.G. SINCLAIR
Local 70125	Ottawa, Ont.	G. DOHERTY
Local 70125	Ottawa, Ont.	B. KEMBALL
Local 70151	Ottawa, Ont.	H.G. LINDSAY
Local 70160	Hull, Qué.	J. LACHAINE
Local 70263	Ottawa, Ont.	N.A. LEMAY
Local 70291	Vanier, Ont.	P. MULVIHILL
Local 70293	Ottawa, Ont.	J. BEAUDRY
Local 70367	Kanata, Ont.	E. PSUTKA
Local 70371	Ottawa, Ont.	G. CURTIS
Local 70372	Ottawa, Ont.	P. FORTUNE
Local 80216	Dartmouth, N.S.	H.W. O'BRIEN
Local 80352	Halifax, N.S.	E. CROOK
Local Y0322	Whitehorse, Y.T.	G. ALLAN

National Health and Welfare Component
Elément de la Santé nationale
et du Bien-être social

Local 00009	Scarborough, Ont.	R. AUDET
Local 10006	Québec, Qué.	J.P. RIVERIN
Local 10007	Montréal, Qué.	J. ROY
Local 20031	Vancouver, B.C.	M. PAULSON
Local 30016	Ottawa, Ont.	V. CHRISTIAN
Local 40027	North Battleford, Sask.	C.A. CARLSON
Local 50011	Winnipeg, Man.	I. PYLYPUIK
Local 70008	Ottawa, Ont.	R. ARMSTRONG
Local 70008	Ottawa, Ont.	A. GRATTON
Local 70008	Ottawa, Ont.	J.W. WHITNEY
Local 80002	Sydney, N.S.	A. MacINTYRE
Local 80003	Halifax, N.S.	L. TAYLOR-LEWIN

Northwest Territoires Public Service Association
Association de la Fonction publique des Territoires du Nord-Ouest

Local x0006	Hay River, N.W.T.	D. CROOK

Public Works Component
Elément des Travaux publics

Local 00031	London, Ont.	B. DENNIS
Local 00033	Ottawa, Ont.	B. KIPPER
Local 00035	North Bay, Ont.	M.A. MARTIN
Local 10011	Vanier, Qué.	J.M. CARPENTIER
Local 10015	Coaticook, Qué.	J.D. PAQUETTE
Local 10121	Lauzon, Qué.	M. O'BRIEN
Local 10161	Montréal, Qué.	L. MAYER
Local 20043	New Westminster, B.C.	D. HANNAFEY
Local 20421	Vancouver, B.C.	J. GORDON
Local 30042	Edmonton, Alta.	R.J. ALLARD
Local 40371	Regina, Sask.	T. ANDREI
Local 70018	Ottawa, Ont.	G. DALGETTY
Local 70019	Ottawa, Ont.	A.S. PULLEY
Local 70021	Ottawa, Ont.	G. LAVERGNE
Local 70023	Ottawa, Ont.	H. MEYER
Local 80052	Halifax, N.S.	C. BAILEY
Local 90011	St. John's, Nfld.	P. DUCEY
Local Y0045	Whitehorse, Y.T.	R. ZACCARELLI

Supply and Services Union
Syndicat des Approvisionnements et Services

Local 50057	Winnipeg, Man.	J. POIRIER
Local 70013	Ottawa, Ont.	B. BOOTH
Local 70013	Ottawa, Ont.	C. GERVAIS
Local 70050	Ottawa, Ont.	R. LEPAGE
Local 80019	Halifax, N.S.	B.J. WILKINS
Local 90020	St. John's, Nfld.	S. NOSEWORTHY

Taxation Division Component
Élément de l'impôt

Local 00012	Belleville, Ont.	C.W. EVANS
Local 00013	Ottawa, Ont.	B. BANNON
Local 00017	London, Ont.	R. BAILEY
Local 00019	Ottawa, Ont.	R. LUNDRIGAN
Local 10005	Shawinigan, Qué.	G. LEDUC
Local 10006	Ottawa, Ont.	J. BERGERON
Local 10007	Sherbrooke, Qué.	R. LAMARCHE
Local 10008	Montréal, Qué.	L. CADIEUX
Local 10009	Rouyn, Qué.	M. MENARD
Local 20028	Victoria, B.C.	J. RUMSBY
Local 30024	Calgary, Alta.	J. ROBERTS
Local 50031	Winnipeg, Man.	T. FRISKEN
Local 60005	Saint John, N.B.	D. FLINN
Local 70010	Ottawa, Ont.	G. JACKSON
Local 90000	St. John's, Nfld.	D.S. O'BRIEN

Union of Energy, Mines and Resources Employees
Syndicat des employés d'Énergie, Mines et Ressources

Local 00210	Toronto, Ont.	M. MacDONALD
Local 10100	Québec, Qué.	J. DROLET
Local 20088	Ottawa, Ont.	J.P. GOUGEON
Local 30177	Ottawa, Ont.	M. LONGTIN
Local 70049	Ottawa, Ont.	R. FAIRFIELD
Local 70049	Ottawa, Ont.	R. MENARD
Local 70049	Ottawa, Ont.	B. MILLER
Local 80013	Dartmouth, N.S.	D. BROWN

Union of National Defence Employees
Union des employés de la Défense nationale

Local 00102	Gander, Nfld.	T. MASON
Local 00201	Summerside, P.E.I.	E. LAUGHLIN
Local 00401	CFB Cornwallis, N.S.	R. WOODLAND
Local 00408	Sydney, N.S.	D.A. KEOUGH
Local 00502	Ottawa, Ont.	B. VILLENEUVE
Local 00527	Ottawa, Ont.	P. MILLETTE
Local 00602	Ottawa, Ont.	R. CHARRON
Local 00607	Gatineau, Qué.	K.A. HAWLEY
Local 00607	Gatineau, Qué.	D. ROCKWELL
Local 00619	CFB Borden, Ont.	D. BUTCHER
Local 00621	Angus, Ont.	D. MILLIKEN
Local 00625	Downsview, Ont.	T. HAMILTON
Local 00637	Trenton, Ont.	M. KENNELL
Local 00652	Ottawa, Ont.	A.P. CORMIER
Local 00704	Shilo, Man.	J. DEGROOT
Local 01001	Vedder Crossing, B.C.	R. PERCHER
Local 01002	Vancouver, B.C.	H. CONNOR
Local 01005	Vedder Crossing, B.C.	M. NEWMAN
Local 10526	Montréal, Qué.	H. GIRARD
Local 21009	Victoria, B.C.	B. HITCHEN
Local 30910	Suffield, Alta.	C. ANTEN
Local 40806	Alsask, Sask.	G.M. DENNEY
Local 60303	Oromocto, N.B.	I. HECTOR
Local 70603	Ottawa, Ont.	B. CAMPBELL
Local 70644	Ottawa, Ont.	E. SCHWAZTZ
Local 80407	Dartmouth, N.S.	C.J. RYAN

Union of Postal-Communications Employees
Syndicat des employé et employées des postes et des communications

Local 00105	Toronto, Ont.	L. BRODIGAN
Local 00111	Mississauga, Ont.	D. ARBUCKLE
Local 00115	Toronto, Ont.	R. CHANDLER
Local 10120	Ottawa, Ont.	D. GAGNON
Local 20104	Ottawa, Ont.	F.V. DOBBIN
Local 70160	Ottawa, Ont.	J.E. POULIN
Local 70180	Ottawa, Ont.	C. BUCHANAN
Local 70707	Ottawa, Ont.	S. ALLAIN

Union of Public Service Commission Employees
Syndicat des employés et employées de la Commission de la Fonction publique

Local 00330	Toronto, Ont.	G. PELLETIER
Local 10377	Ottawa, Ont.	J. HURENS
Local 70140	Hull, Qué.	P. WRIGHT
Local 70155	Ottawa, Ont.	R. DUPUIS

Union of Solicitor General Employees
Union des employés du Solliciteur général

Local 40023	Prince Albert, Sask.	W.G. CAMCHE
Local 70041	Ottawa, Ont.	C. MOLOUGHNEY

Quebec Council of Carpenters
Conseil québécois des charpentiers

Local 00009	Montréal, Qué.	L. CARRIERE

Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union
Union des employés de gros, de détail et de magasins à rayons

Local 00250	Edmonton, Alta.	M. MILLER
Local 00284	Edmonton, Alta.	J.J. PHELAN
Local 00285	Spruce Grove, Alta.	K. McKERNAN
Local 00287	Calgary, Alta.	M. COWAN
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	D. ANDERSON
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	B. BELL
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	R. BROMLEY
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	D. REID
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	B. COATES
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	S. DICESARE
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	R. GAMMON
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	H. LOVIE
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	A. PLAYER
Local 00414	Don Mills, Ont.	L. MAY
Local 00440	Don Mills, Ont.	J. INGRAM
Local 00461	Don Mills, Ont.	A. DUFFY
Local 00461	Don Mills, Ont.	R. WOODRUFF
Local 00467	Winnipeg, Man.	D. MURRAY
Local 00468	Winnipeg, Man.	B. PROZYK
Local 00483	Cardinal, Ont.	P. RIDDELL
Local 00517	Vancouver, B.C.	D. CRAIG
Local 00540	Regina, Sask.	F. CUDDINGTON
Local 00561	Winnipeg, Man.	D. HISCO
Local 00579	Sudbury, Ont.	H. BUCHANAN
Local 00580	Vancouver, B.C.	P. GOEDERS
Local 00580	Vancouver, B.C.	R. MORAES
Local 00582	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	E. CAMIRAND
Local 00597	St. John's, Nfld.	A. POWER
Local 00650	Winnipeg, Man.	D. OSWALD
Local 00755	Winnipeg, Man.	B. SHAND
Local 00895	Winnipeg, Man.	S. TKACHUK
Local 00980	Airdrif, Alta.	C. RICHARDSON

Seafarers' International Union of Canada
Syndicat international des marins canadiens

Thorold Local, Montréal, Qué.	R. THOMASSON
Thunder Bay Local, Montréal, Qué.	D. McMILLAN
Toronto Local, Montréal, Qué.	P. WHITE

Service Employees International Union
Union internationale des employés des services

Local 00183	Belleville, Ont.	R. BREWSTER
Local 00183	Belleville, Ont.	D.J. BURSHAW
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	A. ARSENAULT
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	N. BARRETT
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	A. BILODEAU
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	C. BOISSONNEAULT
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	A. BOURQUE
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	J. BRAVO
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	P. CORBETT
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	P. COURCHESNE
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	R. DAGENAIS
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	R. DAVIDSON
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	N. DESORMEAUX
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	F. DUPONT
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	L. DUVAL
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	J. GOODEN
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	F. JACKSON
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	N. KOPAJKO
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	E. LALIBERTE
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	G. LAMONTAGNE
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	G. LANGLOIS
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	M. LANTHIER
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	J. LARIVIERE
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	J.P. MAIRINO
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	D. PAILLE
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	M. PARKER
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	J. PEPIN
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	L.G. PERRON
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	N. PINET
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	E. ST. PIERRE
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	J. SCOTT
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	G. THOMPSON
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	J. TOMILSON
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	C. TUCK
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	B. WILLIAMS
Local 00204	Toronto, Ont.	M. ZARELLI
Local 00220	London, Ont.	P. MIDDLETON
Local 00220	London, Ont.	D. WILLIS
Local 00268	Thunder Bay, Ont.	R. AMBRO
Local 00268	Thunder Bay, Ont.	M. ARNONE
Local 00268	Thunder Bay, Ont.	C. MacDONALD
Local 00268	Thunder Bay, Ont.	L.J. O'BRIEN
Local 00299	Moose Jaw, Sask.	D. KAYTOR

Local 00299	Moose Jaw, Sask.	W. LEWIS
Local 00333	Saskatoon, Sask.	A. BENTLEY
Local 00333	Saskatoon, Sask.	G. GRIMSTEIT
Local 00333	Saskatoon, Sask.	B. HIGGS
Local 00333	Saskatoon, Sask.	H. HOFFMAN
Local 00333	Saskatoon, Sask.	R. PEARCE
Local 00336	Swift Current, Sask.	J. DYCK
Local 00478	North Bay, Ont.	F. KELLY
Local 00532	Hamilton, Ont.	R. JOHNSON
Local 00902	Halifax, N.S.	P. DIMOCK

Shipyard General Workers' Federation of British Columbia
Fédération des ouvriers des chantiers navals de la Colombie-Britannique

Local 00001	Vancouver, B.C.	W. SCOTT
Local 00003	Victoria, B.C.	S. ROSE
Local 00009	Victoria, B.C.	W. KNIGHT

Telecommunications Workers' Union
Syndicat des travailleurs en télécommunications

Local 00001	Burnaby, B.C.	T. RICHARDSON
Local 00005	Burnaby, B.C.	N. YOUNGS
Local 00007	Burnaby, B.C.	P. ZANDER
Local 00009	Burnaby, B.C.	R. DORVAL
Local 00010	Burnaby, B.C.	S. CROLL
Local 00035	Burnaby, B.C.	L. ARMSTRONG
Local 00038	Burnaby, B.C.	R. IHIEBERT
Local 00042	Burnaby, B.C.	T. NORTH

The Newspaper Guild
La Guilde des journalistes

Local 00087	Toronto, Ont.	J. BRYANT
Local 00087	Toronto, Ont.	P. MALLON
Local 00205	Ottawa, Ont.	M. GANDALL

United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America International Union
Syndicat international des travailleurs unis de l'automobile, de l'aérospatiale et de l'outillage agricole d'Amérique

Local 00027	London, Ont.	J. ASHTON
Local 00027	London, Ont.	A. BAILIE
Local 00027	London, Ont.	D. CADMAN
Local 00027	London, Ont.	T. CARRIE
Local 00027	London, Ont.	B. HARRISON
Local 00027	London, Ont.	A. JACONELLI
Local 00027	London, Ont.	P. KENNEDY
Local 00035	Willowdale, Ont.	D. BENEDICT
Local 00061	Bracebridge, Ont.	S. McINTYRE
Local 00080	Scarborough, Ont.	D. BAZNICK
Local 00089	Amherstburg, Ont.	M. BERTRAND
Local 00089	Amherstburg, Ont	J. VANDENHAM
Local 00112	Downsview, Ont.	G. ARMITAGE

Local 00112	Downsview, Ont.	J. BETTES
Local 00112	Downsview, Ont.	J. DIAS
Local 00112	Downsview, Ont.	B. FLEET
Local 00112	Downsview, Ont.	N.H. SMART
Local 00124	Don Mills, Ont.	E. PRINCE
Local 00127	Chatham, Ont.	J. KENNEDY
Local 00127	Chatham, Ont.	G. LILLEY
Local 00127	Chatham, On t.	H. WARNER
Local 00127	Chatham, Ont.	R. WARNOCK
Local 00127	Chatham, Ont.	B. ZILIO
Local 00195	Windsor, Ont.	G. BASTIEN
Local 00195	Windsor, Ont.	J.P. DIAS
Local 00195	Willowdale, Ont.	S. GILL
Local 00195	Windsor, Ont.	E. HALPIN
Local 00195	Windsor, Ont.	L. HARRISON
Local 00195	Windsor, Ont.	M. McKINNON
Local 00195	Windsor, Ont.	R. PELLERIN
Local 00195	Windsor, Ont.	G.R. SCOTT
Local 00195	Windsor, Ont.	K. SIMPSON
Local 00195	Windsor, Ont.	L. WARK
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	T. ANDERSON
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	G. BARTLEY
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	L. BARTLEY
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	A. BRATTON
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	R. CHAPMAN
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	J. CLOUT
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	J. CONNELL
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	R. DAVIS
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	F. DOUGAN
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	F. JESSOME
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	G. LITTLE
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	R. McSPORRAN
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	G. MICHAUD
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	B. ORR
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	A. SNIDER
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	H. STUBBERT
Local 00199	St. Catharines, Ont.	H. WIEBE
Local 00200	Windsor, Ont.	D. BOOKER
Local 00200	Windsor, Ont.	O. DEMERS
Local 00200	Windsor, Ont.	B. BROUIN
Local 00200	Windsor, Ont.	J. KARN
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	G. BELL
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	M. CANNON
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	A. FIELD
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	P. FINNEY
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	R. FOWLER
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	P. FOX
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	J. GIBB
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	B. HATFIELD
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	R. IRWIN
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	J. McCLOSKEY

Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	D. McGARVEY
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	T. MUNROE
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	E. MURPHY
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	A. O'NEILL
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	R.J. PETERS
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	H. POWERS
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	N. REYNOLDS
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	J. SINCLAIR
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	W. SPENCER
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	W. SUTTON
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	G. TAYLOR
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	J. TREACY
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	C. TUCKER
Local 00222	Oshawa, Ont.	R. WHALEN
Local 00240	Windsor, Ont.	M. MASON
Local 00252	Toronto, Ont.	P. EMANOILIDIS
Local 00252	Toronto, Ont.	L. HAMBERG
Local 00252	Toronto, Ont.	H. KYLE
Local 00252	Toronto, Ont.	D. MARCUS
Local 00275	Welland, Ont.	J. PORTER
Local 00303	Scarborough, Ont.	H. ACORN
Local 00303	Scarborough, Ont.	D. BUNT
Local 00303	Scarborough, Ont.	G. HURMUSES
Local 00303	Scarborough, Ont.	T. McDONNELL
Local 00303	Scarborough, Ont.	A. RAYKO
Local 00374	St. Catharines, Ont.	B.G. HILL
Local 00396	Aurora, Ont.	D. YARDLEY
Local 00397	Brantford, Ont.	R. FILE
Local 00397	Brantford, Ont.	F. TAYLOR
Local 00397	Brantford, Ont.	J. TUBMAN
Local 00432	Winnipeg, Man.	H. MITIC
Local 00439	Toronto, Ont.	J. DUFF
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	R. BEAULIEU
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	Y. BELLEFEUILLE
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	C. BICKFORD
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	T. BURTON
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	G. CLANCY
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	E.A. DUGAL
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	K.S. GERARD
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	M. KIRINCIC
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	R.J. LEBERT
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	B. MILLER
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	L.J. MOSES
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	B. O'CALLAGHAN
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	J. O'NEIL
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	R. REAUME
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	R. WAKEMAN
Local 00444	Windsor, Ont.	J. WALSH
Local 00456	Sarnia, Ont.	B. ORR
Local 00458	Brantford, Ont.	R. TINDALE
Local 00510	Longueuil, Qué.	J.P. FORTIN

Local 00584	Bramalea, Ont.	A. KING
Local 00636	Woodstock, Ont.	J. DAWSON
Local 00636	Woodstock, Ont.	L. JOYCE
Local 00636	Woodstock, Ont.	J. VLUG
Local 00641	Ottawa, Ont.	J.A. STUART
Local 00676	Weston, Ont.	R.J. STRATTON
Local 00676	St. Catharines, Ont.	T. SAVOIE
Local 00707	Oakville, Ont.	T. DELUCA
Local 00707	Oakville, Ont.	B.A. FEIL
Local 00707	Oakville, Ont.	D. HALL
Local 00707	Oakville, Ont.	G. HICKS
Local 00707	Oakville, Ont.	D. HURLEY
Local 00707	Oakville, Ont.	A. PAQUETTE
Local 00707	Oakville, Ont.	K. ROBERTSON
Local 00707	Oakville, Ont.	B. SABINE
Local 00698	Anjou, Qué.	P. LEPAGE
Local 00815	Red Deer, Alta.	C. PHILLIPS
Local 00820	Winnipeg, Man.	B. FARROW
Local 00956	Anjou, Qué.	S. PORTELANCE
Local 01008	Petrolia, Ont.	L. RUSTIN
Local 01032	Paris, Ont.	C. JONKER
Local 01054	Niagara Falls, Ont.	J. GILL
Local 01075	Thunder Bay, Ont.	W. HUBER
Local 01087	Edmonton, Alta.	P. FORDER
Local 01090	Ajax, Ont.	F. DOCHERTY
Local 01090	Ajax, Ont.	J. GATENS
Local 01090	Ajax, Ont.	D. MacPHERSON
Local 01090	Ajax, Ont.	A. VIEIRA
Local 01132	Stratford, Ont.	A. WILLIAMS
Local 01227	Calgary, Alta.	D. PATTERSON
Local 01256	Oakville, Ont.	R. LANDERS
Local 01285	Brampton, Ont.	G. ADAMS
Local 01285	Brampton, Ont.	T. GORMAN
Local 01285	Brampton, Ont.	J. KURTZ
Local 01285	Brampton, Ont.	L. McNEIL
Local 01325	Stratford, Ont.	D. MAXWELL
Local 01421	Georgetown, Ont.	A. EDMUNDS
Local 01451	Kitchener, Ont.	L. ABERLE
Local 01451	Kitchener, Ont.	K. WRIGHT
Local 01498	Windsor, Ont.	L. RIVAIT
Local 01520	St. Thomas, Ont.	G. CAMPBELL
Local 01520	St. Thomas, Ont.	B. GILMOUR
Local 01520	St. Thomas, Ont.	B. HABKIRK
Local 01524	Kitchener, Ont.	A. PICKERSGILL
Local 01524	Kitchener, Ont.	J. WALSH
Local 01525	London, Ont.	R. WALKER
Local 01530	Belleville, Ont.	B. ROVERS
Local 01535	Bramalea, Ont.	P.J. CRONKRIGHT
Local 01538	Belleville, Ont.	B. YOUNG
Local 01566	Cambridge, Ont.	B. DAVIDSON
Local 01580	Anjou, Qué.	C. DUCHARME

Local 01620	Huron Park, Ont.	F. PIERCEY
Local 01661	Hawkesbury, Ont.	G. SEGUIN
Local 01767	Brampton, Ont.	K. OUELLETTE
Local 01780	Cambridge, Ont.	T. ROOKE
Local 01837	Kingston, Ont.	G. STOCK
Local 01839	Belleville, Ont.	O. WARREN
Local 01849	Montréal, Qué.	Y. ROBERGE
Local 01859	Tillsonburg, Ont.	V. PARRINGTON
Local 01900	Montréal, Qué.	R. FRANCIS
Local 01905	Saint John, N.B.	P.F. McNAMEE
Local 01915	Bramalea, Ont.	D. CLARK
Local 01915	Bramalea, Ont.	F. JACKSON
Local 01915	Bramalea, Ont.	D. MONIE
Local 01917	Guelph, Ont.	R. ULIANA
Local 01941	Tilbury, Ont.	R. HOPE
Local 01965	Toronto, Ont.	T. WOHLFARTH
Local 01967	Mississauga, Ont.	T. BURNS
Local 01967	Mississauga, Ont.	D. HUNTER
Local 01967	Mississauga, Ont.	B. PATRICK
Local 01967	Mississauga, Ont.	S. ROBERTSON
Local 01967	Mississauga, Ont.	T. TOVEY
Local 01973	Windsor, Ont.	M. CAPUTO
Local 01973	Windsor, Ont.	P. CLANCY
Local 01973	Windsor, Ont.	N. DZUDZ
Local 01973	Windsor, Ont.	L. DERDAELE
Local 01973	Windsor, Ont.	B. HE[illegible]LEY
Local 01973	Windsor, Ont.	E. KAVANAUGH
Local 01973	Windsor, Ont.	M. LA BUTTE
Local 01973	Windsor, Ont.	G. SPENCER
Local 01973	Windsor, Ont.	G.F. WILSON
Local 01980	Markham, Ont.	R. SMITH
Local 01985	Oakville, Ont.	D. McINTYRE
Local 00207	Windsor, Ont.	H. STORK
Local 02028	Winfield, B.C.	R. NICKERSON
Local 02163	Ingersoll, Ont.	F. BERTO
Local 02169	Winnipeg, Man.	W. LYNCH
Local 02171	Burnaby, B.C.	C. MENEGHINI
Local 02176	Cambridge, Ont.	L. HOPE
Local 02213	Mississauga, Ont.	J. ARMSTRONG
Local 02213	Mississauga, Ont.	C. KRYZANIWSKY
Local 02213	Mississauga, Ont.	J. LAWRENCE
Local 02213	Mississauga, Ont.	M. LESCRAIGNE
Local 02213	Mississauga, Ont.	T. LINDSAY
Local 02213	Mississauga, Ont.	C. MALONEY
Local 02213	Mississauga, Ont.	P. NASH
Local 02213	Willowdale, Ont.	T. SAUNDERS
Local 02224	Winnipeg, Man.	P. MAGDA

United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of Canada
Travaillers unis de l'électricité, de la radio et de la machinerie du Canada

Local 00504	Hamilton, Ont.	A. PATERSON
Local 00509	Trenton, Ont.	D.E. WEESE
Local 00512	Toronto, Ont.	J. McCABE
Local 00520	Hamilton, Ont.	D. FITZGERALD
Local 00521	Toronto, Ont.	B. WALSH
Local 00522	Kingston, Ont.	O.G. DOYLE
Local 00523	Welland, Ont.	G. CHATWIN
Local 00523	Welland, Ont.	R. McCALLION
Local 00524	Peterborough, Ont.	P.T. HOW
Local 00529	Welland, Ont.	J. TRUFAL
Local 00540	Peterborough, Ont.	W. WOODBECK
Local 00542	Barrie, Ont.	A. PETERS
Local 00544	Richmond Hill, Ont.	S. MacDONALD
Local 00546	London, Ont.	G. SNYDER
Local 00549	Hamilton, Ont.	R. SLAGHT
Local 00550	Hamilton, Ont.	L. MILLEN
Local 00555	Hamilton, Ont.	W. RENWICK
Local 00556	St-Laurent, Qué.	O. NUNEZ
Local 00558	Hamilton, Ont.	J. TURK
Local 00560	Saint-Jean, Qué.	R. ROY
Local 00562	Montréal, Qué.	A. ROMERO
Local 00565	Montréal, Qué.	D. CORBEIL
Local 00566	Don Mills, Ont.	K. SCOURFIELD

United Fishermen & Allied Workers' Union
Syndicat des pêcheurs et travailleurs assimilés

Local 00001	Vancouver, B.C.	N. CARR
Local 00002	Vancouver, B.C.	J. NICHOL
Local 00004	Vancouver, B.C.	G. MEGGS
Local 00005	Vancouver, B.C.	B. OGDEN
Local 00007	Vancouver, B.C.	A. THOMLINSON
Local 00008	Vancouver, B.C.	B. PROCOPATION
Local 00009	Vancouver, B.C.	J. SINCLAIR
Local 00010	Vancouver, B.C.	M. MUENCH
Local 00015	Vancouver, B.C.	B. MIRKOVICH
Local 00017	Vancouver, B.C.	D. BROWN
Local 00026	Vancouver, B.C.	D. KARJALA
Local 00031	Vancouver, B.C.	F. COX
Local 00031	Vancouver, B.C.	J. THORKELSON
Local 00035	Vancouver, B.C.	B. HALE
Local 00037	Vancouver, B.C.	J. RUSHTON
Local 00048	Vancouver, B.C.	M. JOHNSON
Local 00049	Vancouver, B.C.	J. RADOSEVIC

United Food and Commercial Workers' International Union
Syndicat international des travailleurs unis de l'alimentation et du commerce

Local 00068	Toronto, Ont.	H. ANDRADE

Local 00082	Toronto, Ont.	M. FEDERMAN
Local 00102A	Montréal, Qué.	T. LAPORTE
Local 00111	Winnipeg, Man.	D. ATKINSON
Local 00111	Winnipeg, Man.	V. DERRAUGH
Local 00111	Winnipeg, Man.	E. ST. MARIE
Local 00111	Winnipeg, Man.	B. ZIMMER
Local 00114P	Toronto, Ont.	N. ALEXANDER
Local 00114P	Toronto, Ont.	M. KOLTON
Local 00173	Waterloo, Ont.	J. KARAI
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	R. ANDERSON
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	M. BRAUN
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	C. CLERMONT
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	D. CORRIGAN
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	J. DI NARDO
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	B. DOW
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	N. DYRLA
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	J. FISCHER
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	S. GRANT
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	W. HANLEY
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	W.E. HANLEY
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	D. HANNAH
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	M. JOWETT
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	P. McFAWN
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	J. MONTGOMERY
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	B. NOSEWORTHY
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	B. RENO
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	B. RICHARDSON
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	D. SEXTON
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	A. SWARBRICK
Local 00175	Rexdale, Ont.	B. THOMPSON
Local 00206	Kitchener, Ont.	J. ANDRESS
Local 00206	Kitchener, Ont.	J. COLVIN
Local 00206	Kitchener, Ont.	C. EVANS
Local 00206	Kitchener, Ont.	J. HASTINGS
Local 00206	Kitchener, Ont.	R. SPRINGALL
Local 00225P	Montréal, Qué.	Z. DOLCE
Local 00248	Saskatoon, Sask.	G. COOK
Local 00280P	Edmonton, Alta.	G. STEELE
Local 00287	Toronto, Ont.	A. HERSHKOVITZ
Local 00305	Sudbury, Ont.	J. WEIR
Local 00312A	Edmonton, Alta.	D. SIM
Local 00329	Rexdale, Ont.	W. RANNACHAN
Local 00334	Hamilton, Ont.	R. HILL
Local 00357	Montréal, Qué.	J.C. KELLY
Local 00364	Saint John, N.B.	G. McMILLAN Jr.
Local 00368P	Montréal, Qué.	H. PLAMONDON
Local 00373A	Calgary, Alta.	V. CARR
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	F. BUDGELL
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	K. BUNDY
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	L. HARDIE
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	N. KINNEY

Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	J. KINSHELLA
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	C. LANNEVILLE
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	J. LEEYUS
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	N. MARTIN
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	R. McWILLIAMS
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	A. MILEWICZ
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	D. O'HALLORAN
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	R. PEARSON
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	D. SMITH
Local 00401	Edmonton, Alta.	G. WHITLOCK
Local 00409	Thunder Bay, Ont.	M. FRASER
Local 00409	Thunder Bay, Ont.	G. MORRIS
Local 00452P	Wainfleet, Ont.	L. FISHER
Local 00459	Leamington, Ont.	L. BACHMEIER
Local 00486	Ottawa, Ont.	B. BAILY
Local 00486	Ottawa, Ont.	J. FACETTE
Local 00486	Ottawa, Ont.	A. POULIN
Local 00486	Ottawa, Ont.	J.G. SEGUIN
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	N. ANCTIL
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	C. DELORME
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	R. DISTILIO
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	M. FILATO
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	F. GUERARD
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	B. INGLEY
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	F. LAUZON
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	J.G. LEVESQUE
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	J.P. OUELLETTE
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	J. TOUPIN
Local 00500	Montréal, Qué.	R. VAILLANCOURT
Local 00501	Montréal, Qué.	J. LAROUCHE
Local 00501	Montréal, Qué.	M. ROBERT
Local 00501	Montréal, Qué.	G. ROLLIN
Local 00501	Montréal, Qué.	T. TOUNTAS
Local 00502	Montréal, Qué.	W.E. MacKAY
Local 00502	Montréal, Qué.	Y. MARION
Local 00502	Montréal, Qué.	A. SERABJIT-SINGH
Local 00502	Montréal, Qué.	S. WARD
Local 00503	Québec, Qué.	L. FILTEAU
Local 00503	Québec, Qué.	L. HINTON
Local 00503	Québec, Qué.	F. ROCHETTE
Local 00503	Québec, Qué.	M. TREMBLAY
Local 00504	Sherbrooke, Qué.	C. BERARD
Local 00511P	Calgary, Alta.	E. WARD
Local 00529P	Toronto, Ont.	V. GENTILE
Local 00530	Toronto, Ont.	G. GALLAGHER
Local 00537	Montréal, Qué.	J. GLADU
Local 00541P	Delta, B.C.	M.U. DA SILVA
Local 00615	Montréal, Qué.	L. BARON
Local 00633	Rexdale, Ont.	F. GUTCHER
Local 00633	Rexdale, Ont.	A.G. SHERMAN
Local 00720	Montréal, Qué.	L. HUGUEROT

Local 00725A	Rexdale, Ont.	M. McKAY
Local 00744P	Montréal, Qué.	U. BASTARACHE
Local 00798	Carberry, Man.	C. WATTERSON
Local 00832	Winnipeg, Man.	R. ANDRZEJEWSKI
Local 00832	Winnipeg, Man.	M. BILLETT
Local 00832	Winnipeg, Man.	A. DUCKWORTH
Local 00832	Winnipeg, Man.	L. HIGGINS
Local 00832	Winnipeg, Man.	D. MacMILLAN
Local 00832	Winnipeg, Man.	M. McWILLIAM
Local 00832	Winnipeg, Man.	C. MILLEN
Local 00832	Winnipeg, Man.	A. PETERS
Local 00832	Winnipeg, Man.	C. SZALAI
Local 00856	Belleville, Ont.	C. McCORMICK
Local 01000A	Rexdale, Ont.	K. CORPORON
Local 01000A	Rexdale, Ont.	W. COX
Local 01000A	Rexdale, Ont.	D. GILBERT
Local 01000A	Rexdale, Ont.	K. PARK
Local 01105P	Rexdale, Ont.	D. DAYMAN
Local 01105P	Rexdale, Ont.	G. HAYCOCK
Local 01105P	Rexdale, Ont.	R. HIBBERD
Local 01230	Cobourg, Ont.	C. COOPER
Local 01230	Cobourg, Ont.	Y. RITCHIE
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	B. BAKER
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	A. BONIA
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	R. CASHIN
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	G. CHAFE
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	K. CONDON
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	C. CRIBB
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	E. DAY
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	J. DURNFORD
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	P. FOGARTY
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	G. GARDINER
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	G. HACKETT
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	N. HUTCHINGS
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	F. KEEPING
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	L. LANDER
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	E. LOCKYER
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	J. LUMSDEN
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	P. MARTELL
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	L. McCORMICK
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	E. McCURDY
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	B. McCLEAN
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	E. MILLER
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	H. MOULAND
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	J. MUTFORD
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	B. PARSONS
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	C. PEACH
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	P. POWER
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	W. REID
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	K. RIGGS
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	H. SMALL

Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	W. STOCKLEY
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	D. WARD
Local 01252	St. John's, Nfld.	D. YOUNG
Local 01400	Saskatoon, Sask.	C. JONES
Local 01400	Saskatoon, Sask.	S. WEIGEL
Local 01400	Saskatoon, Sask.	W. WHALLEY
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	J. ALLARD
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	S. CARRIER
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	H. CRANNA
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	B. DENTON
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	B. ELLIOTT
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	G. GOUNDRY
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	J. MISCHOOK
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	E. RENNOX
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	C. ROBINSON
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	L. SALLOUM
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	S.L. SHERMAN
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	S. STREIFEL
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	D. WILKINSON
Local 01518	Burnaby, B.C.	B. WOOLEY
Local 01973	Halifax, N.S.	B. DURNO
Local 01973	Halifax, N.S.	J. McKINNON
Local 01973B	Halifax, N.S.	M. FLANNIGAN
Local 01977	Guelph, Ont.	B. McINTYRE
Local 01977	Guelph, Ont.	B. NEATH
Local 01977	Guelph, Ont.	K. SCHICKLER
Local 01979	Frankford, Ont.	I. REILLY
Local 02000	New Westminster, B.C.	L. HANSEN
Local 02000	New Westminster, B.C.	R. NAIRNE
Local 02000	New Westminster, B.C.	L. NIESSEN
Local 02000	New Westminster, B.C.	C. SKREPETZ

United Garment Workers of America
Travailleurs unis du vêtement d'Amérique

Local 00035	Winnipeg, Man.	F. ARRO
Local 00120	Edmonton, Alta.	A. OZIPKO
Local 00232	Richmond, B.C.	K. MUDRY
Local 00396	Moose Jaw, Sask.	D. WIERINGA
Local 00483	Vancouver, B.C.	F. DI-CESARE

United Mine Workers of America
Mineurs unis d'Amérique

Local 1047	Inverness, N.S.	W. EVASUK
Local 1888	New Waterford, N.S.	G. DEMETER
Local 02633	Coleman, Alta.	D. REAMAN
Local 04514	Springhill, N.S.	B. BURCHELL
Local 04520	Glace Bay, N.S.	J.T. CAMPBELL
Local 07292	Sparwood, B.C.	F. LESKOSEK
Local 07292	Sparwood, B.C.	J. RALZ
Local 07409	Glace Bay, N.S.	D. MacRAE

United Paperworkers International Union
Syndicat international des travailleurs unis du papier

Local 00665	Terrace Bay, Ont.	F.C. HURLEY
Local 00665	Terrace Bay, Ont.	D. LAVIGNE

United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America
Union des ouvriers unis du caoutchouc, liège, linoléum et plastique d'Amérique

Local 00067	Kitchener, Ont.	W. SAMUELSON
Local 00090	Kitchener, Ont.	P. HENDERSON
Local 00113	Hamilton, Ont.	R. ZAWISLAK
Local 00232	Toronto, Ont.	G. ARMSTRONG
Local 00232	Toronto, Ont.	C. BABSEVICIUS
Local 00536	Barrie, Ont.	N. ST-LAURENT
Local 00677	Kitchener, Ont.	M. COOPER
Local 00733	Brantford, Ont.	R.J. WHITE
Local 00994	Bramalea, Ont.	C. McDOUGALL

United Steelworkers of America
Metallurgistes unis d'Amérique

Local 00343	Kingston, Ont.	D.M. HERRINGTON
Local 00480	Trail, B.C.	K. GEORGETTI
Local 00480	Trail, B.C.	D. PELLETIER
Local 00651	Kimberley, B.C.	T. HILL
Local 00871	Charlesbourg, Qué.	M. BUREAU
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	J.D. BALLOCH
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	G. BEATTIE
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	T. DI DONATO
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	R.G. FERGUSON
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	R.G. FLEET
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	D.E. FRASER
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	G.I. GILKS
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	B. GREENWOOD
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	J. MARTIN
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	R.R. McSEVNEY
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	R.J. SILENZI
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	R.T. SMITH
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	E. SUTHERLAND
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	R.S. SUTTON
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	T.W. WEAYMOUTH
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	T.A. WHITE
Local 01005	Hamilton, Ont.	P. ZAFIRIDES
Local 01031	Hamilton, Ont.	E. REPA
Local 01111	Toronto, Ont.	D. RIDEOUT
Local 02000	Cambridge, Ont.	M. KECK
Local 02251	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	D. ABERNOT
Local 02251	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	J. CUSHLEY
Local 02251	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	C. FRAYN
Local 02251	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	F. JOLICOEUR
Local 02251	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	G. LACASSE
Local 02251	Sault Ste. Marie. Ont.	A. LAVOIE

Local 02251	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	A. MANCINI
Local 02251	Kingston, Ont.	J. OSTROSKI
Local 02251	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	W. SEABROOK
Local 02251	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	L. WOODCOCK
Local 02366	Montréal, Qué.	N. POLIQUIN
Local 02423	Montréal, Qué.	J.P. FOREST
Local 02729	Toronto, Ont.	J. TESSIER
Local 02784	Oshawa, Ont.	B. CORMIER
Local 02820	Toronto, Ont.	F. HINES
Local 02858	Toronto, Ont.	S.C. WHARTON
Local 02859	Cambridge, Ont.	D. MILLS
Local 02868	Hamilton, Ont.	A. RUSHTON
Local 02868	Hamilton, Ont.	W. TURK
Local 02894	Cambridge, Ont.	C. BRANNEN
Local 02900	Toronto, Ont.	M. HERSH
Local 02904	Cambridge, Ont.	C. WIGHTMAN
Local 02918	London, Ont.	S. DEGRAW
Local 02940	Hamilton, Ont.	D. CUNCIC
Local 02946	Toronto, Ont.	S. JACKSON
Local 02952	New Westminster, B.C.	J. KELAVA
Local 03000	Guelph, Ont.	P. MATARELLI
Local 03021	Guelph, Ont.	R. ORREGO
Local 03129	Toronto, Ont.	B. ELMY
Local 03208	Lansdowne, Ont.	V. MICALLEF
Local 03209	Gananoque, Ont.	R. RUNNING
Local 03250	Hamilton, Ont.	W. SCANDLAN
Local 03252	Toronto, Ont.	T.Z. LISINSKI
Local 03292	Waterloo, Ont.	J. RAE
Local 03313	London, Ont.	P. MITCHELL
Local 03315	Toronto, Ont.	K. HARPER
Local 03390	Toronto, Ont.	B. SIMON
Local 03505	Hamilton, Ont.	J. MORGAN
Local 03647	Dorval, Qué.	J. SEVIGNY
Local 03692	Hamilton, Ont.	R. JONES
Local 03767	Toronto, Ont.	B. MACAULAY
Local 03789	Fergus, Ont.	T.J. MARTIN
Local 03813	Toronto, Ont.	W. SIMPSON
Local 03950	Toronto, Ont.	A. FINNIE
Local 04025	New Toronto, Ont.	W. STEPHAN
Local 04054	Guelph, Ont.	P. BURKE
Local 04066	Vancouver, B.C.	D. POSNICK
Local 04087	Winnipeg, Man.	L. STEVENS
Local 04151	Niagara Falls, Ont.	R. WILSON
Local 04170	Montréal, Qué.	G. BEAULIEU Sr.
Local 04215	Toronto, Ont.	J. STEWART
Local 04253	Trenton, N.S.	F.J. SOBODA
Local 04297	Winnipeg, Man.	B. HUNT
Local 04440	Timmins, Ont.	R.L. LADOUCEUR
Local 04509	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	B. LOGAN
Local 04574	Toronto, Ont.	J. FITZPATRICK
Local 04589	Montréal, Qué.	A. DUGAS

Local 04590	Montréal, Qué.	J.G. FRENETTE
Local 04605	Cambridge, Ont.	C. WILTON
Local 04632	Renfrew, Ont.	M. BEAN
Local 04656	Guelph, Ont.	W. CRAWFORD
Local 04694	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	G. BLAIS
Local 04697	Orillia, Ont.	G. OATEN
Local 04790	Milton, Ont.	D. HART
Local 04815	St. Thomas, Ont.	J. ROSE
Local 04848	Toronto, Ont.	M. TOBIN
Local 04885	Scarborough, Ont.	C. WHYTE
Local 04906	St. Thomas, Ont.	L. BOWES
Local 04990	Belmont, Ont.	B. SHUBROOK
Local 05009	Peterborough, Ont.	M. YOUNG
Local 05048	Wawa, Ont.	A. RAMSAY
Local 05055	Thunder Bay, Ont.	H. GAREAU
Local 05147	Toronto, Ont.	H. MICKALOW
Local 05165	Toronto, Ont.	H. MacKENZIE
Local 05220	Edmonton, Alta.	D. WILLIS
Local 05264	Toronto, Ont.	H. SINGH
Local 05328	Hamilton, Ont.	D. MacPHERSON
Local 05328	Hamilton, Ont.	G.J. RITCHIE
Local 05328	Hamilton, Ont.	B. STETSON
Local 05385	Bathurst, N.B.	J. PICKARD
Local 05390	Etobocke, Ont.	C. SNIDER
Local 05417	Elliot Lake, Ont.	B. BRIYSON
Local 05417	Elliot Lake, Ont.	C. CHENIER
Local 05417	Elliot Lake, Ont.	D. HUTCHINSON
Local 05442	Selkirk, Man.	R. SKALESKY
Local 05481	Thunder Bay, Ont.	G. BRIGDEN
Local 05482	Toronto, Ont.	J. BARRIE
Local 05483	Vaughan, Ont.	W. McATEER
Local 05533	Belleville, Ont.	G. SINCLAIR
Local 05595	Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	C. WHITE
Local 05599	Kitchener, Ont.	J.W. SIMONEK
Local 05629	Bramalea, Ont.	R. FALCONER
Local 05762	Elliot Lake, Ont.	I. CHEVRIER
Local 05762	Elliot Lake, Ont.	M. DEPATIE
Local 05795	Labrador City, Nfld.	A. BANFIELD
Local 05795	Labrador City, Nfld.	A. HUXTER
Local 05815	Elliot Lake, Ont.	D. MELLOR
Local 05927	Toronto, Ont.	R. VARLEY
Local 05980	Elliot Lake, Ont.	S. BONIFERRO
Local 06028	Fergus, Ont.	W.R. THOMPSON
Local 06098	Stoney Creek, Ont.	J.P. MARTEL
Local 06166	Thompson, Man.	A. MacLELLAN
Local 06166	Thompson, Man.	B. McGRATH
Local 06197	Toronto, Ont.	S. RODRIGUE
Local 06204	Labrador City, Nfld.	R. YOUNG
Local 06258	Toronto, Ont.	K. OLEKSIUK
Local 06269	Toronto, Ont.	R. ARMSTRONG
Local 06363	Sudbury, Ont.	J.P. ROULEAU

Local 06409	Kirkland Lake, Ont.	A. JACKSON
Local 06480	Labrador City, Nfld.	J. KINGSTON
Local 06495	Guelph, Ont.	J. PUDBE
Local 06497	Port Hope, Ont.	P. HILLS
Local 06500	Sudbury, Ont.	D. CAMPBELL
Local 06500	Sudbury, Ont.	J. CLARKE
Local 06500	Toronto, Ont.	L.W. GERARD
Local 06500	Sudbury, Ont.	J. KMIT
Local 06500	Sudbury, Ont.	R. LAROSE
Local 06500	Sudbury, Ont.	R. TAYLOR
Local 06500	Sudbury, Ont.	B. YOUNG
Local 06519	St. Anns, Ont.	J.H. SMYTH
Local 06520	St. Catharines, Ont.	S. DIETSCH
Local 06536	Cassiar, B.C.	D. BROCKLEBANK
Local 06540	Toronto, Ont.	I. KIRKPATRICK
Local 06540	Toronto, Ont.	F. NUNES
Local 06571	Oshawa, Ont.	R. SLAVIN
Local 06572	Scarborough, Ont.	D. KLINCK
Local 06586	Contrecoeur, Qué.	R. PROULX
Local 06586	Contrecoeur, Qué.	G. VIAU
Local 06591	Charlesbourg, Qué.	J.E. SIMARD
Local 06595	St. Catharines, Ont.	R. MERRICK
Local 06609	Sudbury, Ont.	J. KEUHL
Local 06624	Toronto, Ont.	C.A. SCEVIOUR
Local 06673	Calgary, Alta.	S. KENDRICK
Local 06727	Toronto, Ont.	E. PESTAND
Local 06754	Rexdale, Ont.	A. HEDD
Local 06791	Burlington, Ont.	D. BARLETT
Local 06854	Welland, Ont.	R. MATTIE
Local 06868	Hamilton, Ont.	R. WYATT
Local 06933	Toronto, Ont.	R. COCKBURN
Local 06976	Guelph, Ont.	G. SCHAEFER
Local 07024	Richmond Hill, Ont.	A. LELACHEUR
Local 07049	St. Catharines, Ont.	O. URBANOVICS
Local 07062	Hamilton, Ont.	B. RUSHTON
Local 07065	Sept-Îles, Qué.	C. GODBOUT
Local 07105	Toronto, Ont.	J. KELLY
Local 07135	Hamilton, Ont.	R. BOCSKEI
Local 07148	Winnipeg, Man.	K. DELANEY
Local 07204	Hamilton, Ont.	S. RAITSINIS
Local 07226	Calgary, Alta.	B. PARSONS
Local 07267	Timmins, Ont.	M. FARRELL
Local 07276	Toronto, Ont.	G. MURPHY
Local 07282	Sudbury, Ont.	N. CARRIER
Local 07285	Thetford Mines, Qué.	A. FILLION
Local 07291	Toronto, Ont.	D. FISK
Local 07428	Trinity Bay, Nfld.	S.F. GHANEY
Local 07455	Toronto, Ont.	D. MacKENZIE
Local 07458	Saskatoon, Sask.	R. FISHER
Local 07574	Mississauga, Ont.	A. CAJILIG
Local 07575	Toronto, Ont.	J. ZWARA

Local 07578	Sudbury, Ont.	W. FRASER
Local 07607	Toronto, Ont.	M. BAKSH
Local 07625	Montréal, Qué.	P. FOUCAULT
Local 07633	Toronto, Ont.	F. BERRY
Local 07649	Thetford Mines, Qué.	A. BROCHU
Local 07656	Saskatoon, Sask.	H. HEATON
Local 07657	Waterloo, Ont.	L. WEADICK
Local 07676	Beresford, N.B.	L. McBREARTY
Local 07685	Rexdale, Ont.	N. DIXON
Local 07713	Baie Verte, Nfld.	G. DWYER
Local 07727	Sudbury, Ont.	S. GUILLET
Local 07742	St-Laurent, Qué.	G. NUNZIO
Local 07777	Welland, Ont.	W. WAKUNICK
Local 07791	Sudbury, Ont.	H. SEGUIN
Local 07801	Thetford Mines, Qué.	J. LETOURNEAU
Local 07811	Thetford Mines, Qué.	R. DERAICHE
Local 07812	St-Jérôme, Qué.	C. LACELLE
Local 07884	Elkford, B.C.	K. NEWMANN
Local 07895	Montréal, Qué.	T. GAGNE
Local 07911	Thompson, Man.	W. CUTTING
Local 07921	Toronto, Ont.	H. CARTER
Local 07932	Montréal, Qué.	J. LEPAGE
Local 07949	Bracebridge, Ont.	D. WATERS
Local 07964	Kirkland Lake, Ont.	R. AUBUT
Local 08026	Thetford Mines, Qué.	R. PLANTE
Local 08030	Toronto, Ont.	M. CRISTIANO
Local 08039	Rexdale, Ont.	N. HENRY
Local 08189	Winnipeg, Man.	J.C. DEGRACE
Local 08207	Toronto, Ont.	B. PARIS
Local 08214	Stoney Creek, Ont.	J. CARLETTA
Local 08284	St-Jean, Qué.	L. LAFAILLE
Local 08328	Concord, Ont.	C. DA SILVA
Local 08341	Concord, Ont.	R. ROBSON
Local 08407	Selkirk, Man.	S.M. KELLEY
Local 08412	Richmond Hill, Ont.	M. SEAWARD
Local 08428	St-Jean, Qué.	R. BOUCHARD
Local 08449	Cassiar, B.C.	B. CAVANAGH
Local 08483	Hamilton, Ont.	B. DESROCHES
Local 08485	Rexdale, Ont.	R. HUNT
Local 08505	Toronto, Ont.	H.S. DHANDA
Local 08519	Elliot Lake, Ont.	B.R. BUSHEY
Local 08617	Saskatoon, Sask.	T. STEVENS
Local 08782	Jarvis, Ont.	H. HYND
Local 08782	Jarvis, Ont.	A. McKINNON
Local 08848	Port Credit, Ont.	R. MacDONALD
Local 08900	St. Catharines, Ont.	D. LARGE
Local 08922	Montréal, Qué.	G. AUDETTE
Local 08922	Montréal, Qué.	G. ROUSSE
Local 08950	Mississauga, Ont.	K. SIGNORETTI
Local 08990	Montréal, Qué.	M. LEBEAU
Local 09015	Mississauga, Ont.	J. WOODS

Local 09033	Brampton, Ont.	J. ELLIOTT
Local 09038	Scarborough, Ont.	D. HUNT
Local 09046	Toronto, Ont.	R. HEIKURA
Local 09049	Toronto, Ont.	H. LEGENDRE
Local 09050	Scarborough, Ont.	P. NERETLIAK
Local 09056	Toronto, Ont.	R. PARIS
Local 09065	St-Jean, Qué.	C. GAREAU
Local 09118	Cambridge, Ont.	J. CURRAN
Local 09139	Toronto, Ont.	I. DOSSA
Local 09705	Trail, B.C.	G. TITSWORTH
Local 13142	Glenwalter, Ont.	E. MARTIN
Local 13173	Port Hope, Ont.	D. BEMMA
Local 13286	New Toronto, Ont.	R. CRONSHAW
Local 13328	Toronto, Ont.	A. HARTE
Local 13491	West Hill, Ont.	T. WALSH
Local 13571	Toronto, Ont.	G. PENNY
Local 13691	Elmira, Ont.	G. PARSONS
Local 14045	Toronto, Ont.	G. TALBOT
Local 14059	Niagara Falls, Ont.	P. GRASSO
Local 14092	Hamilton, Ont.	W. FULLER
Local 14183	Toronto, Ont.	M. QUASHIE
Local 14209	Toronto, Ont.	T. ROBINSON
Local 14229	Toronto, Ont.	T. LUNDRIGAN
Local 14232	Toronto, Ont.	G. LAMB
Local 14831	Mississauga, Ont.	B. SINGH
Upholsters	Phila. PA., U.S.A.	D. THERIAULT

United Textile Workers of America
Ouvriers unis des textiles d'Amérique

Local 00469	Cornwall, Ont.	S. CONDIE

United Transportation Union
Travailleurs unis des transports

Local 00537	Niagara Falls, Ont.	T.S. SECORD
Local 00701	Coquitlam, B.C.	P. LAWRENCE
Local 01144	Melville, Sask.	P.R. CHAMPAGNE
Local 01874	Winnipeg, Man.	B.J. HENRY

DIRECTLY CHARTERED UNIONS — UNIONS À CHARTE DIRECTE

(Atlantic Region — Région de l'Atlantique)

Association of Commercial and Technical Employees No. 1679(A)	F. MILLER
Union of Bank Employees, Local 2107	S. LOTHERINGTON

(Région du Québec — Quebec Region)

Montreal Can Workers' Federal Union, Local 353 Syndicat des travailleurs du contenant, section locale 353	D. CARON

(Ontario Region — Région de l'Ontario)

London National Brewery Workers' Union, Local 1	J. ROOT
Canadian Association of Motion Picture and Electronic Recording Artists, Local 81	L. KELLY
Hamilton Can Workers' Federal Union No. 354	W. MOORE
Kingston Heating and Maintenance Workers Union, Local 229	J. FRASER
Kingston Technicians and Clerical Workers' Union, Local 254	A. McPHAIL
Chalk River Nuclear Technicians and Technologists, Local 1568	K.E. CHAPMAN
Chalk River Nuclear Process Operators, Local 1601	C. SYRIE
Union of Bank Employees, Local 2104	M. WOODLEY

(Prairie Region — Région des Prairies)

Association of Commercial and Technical Employees, Local 1725	M. BURRELL

(Pacific Region — Région du Pacifique)

Grain Workers Union, Local 333	H. KANCS